arXiv:0806.2433v2 [math.AP] 28 Jun 2008

WELL-POSEDNESS OF THE WATER-WAVE PROBLEM WITH SURFACE TENSION

MEI MING AND ZHIFEI ZHANG

Abstract. In this paper, we prove the local well-posedness of the water wave problem with surface tension in the case of finite depth by working in the Eulerian setting. For the flat bottom, as surface tension tends to zero, the solution of the water wave problem with surface tension converges to the solution of the water wave problem without surface tension.

1. Introduction

1.1. **Presentation of the problem.** In this paper, we are concerned with the motion of an ideal, incompressible, irrotational gravity fluid influenced by surface tension on its surface in the case of finite depth. We restrict our attention to the case when the surface is a graph parameterized by a function $\zeta(t, X)$ where t denotes the time variable, and $X = (X_1, ..., X_d)$ denotes the horizontal spacial variables. The bottom of fluid is parameterized by a function $b(X)$. We denote the fluid domain at time t by Ω_t. The motion of the fluid in Ω_t is described by the incompressible Euler equation

$$\partial_t V + V \cdot \nabla_{X,y} V = -ge_{d+1} - \nabla_{X,y} P \qquad \text{in} \quad \Omega_t,\ t \geq 0 \tag{1.1}$$

where $-ge_{d+1} = (0, \cdots, 0, -g)$ denotes the acceleration of gravity and $V = (V_1, ..., V_d, V_{d+1})$ denotes the velocity field (V_{d+1} is the vertical component). The incompressibility of the fluid is expressed by

$$\operatorname{div} V = 0 \qquad \text{in} \quad \Omega_t,\ t \geq 0, \tag{1.2}$$

and the irrotationality means that

$$\operatorname{curl} V = 0 \qquad \text{in} \quad \Omega_t,\ t \geq 0. \tag{1.3}$$

Assume that no fluid particles are transported across the surface. At the bottom, this is given by

$$V_n|_{y=b(X)} := \mathbf{n}_- \cdot\ V|_{y=b(X)} = 0 \qquad \text{for} \quad t > 0, X \in \mathbb{R}^d \tag{1.4}$$

where $\mathbf{n}_- := \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+|\nabla_X b|^2}}(\nabla_X b, -1)^T$ denotes the outward normal vector to the lower boundary of Ω_t. At the free surface, the boundary condition is kinematic

---

Date: June 26.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35Q35.

Key words and phrases. Water waves, Dirichlet-Neumann operator, surface tension.

The second author is partially supported by NSF of China under Grant 10601002.

and is given by

$$\partial_t \zeta - \sqrt{1+|\nabla_X \zeta|^2} V_n|_{y=\zeta(X)} = 0 \qquad \text{for} \quad t>0, X \in \mathbb{R}^d \tag{1.5}$$

where $V_n = \mathbf{n}_+ \cdot V|_{y=\zeta(X)}$, with $\mathbf{n}_+ := \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+|\nabla_X \zeta|^2}}(-\nabla_X \zeta, 1)^T$ denoting the outward normal vector to the free surface.

With surface tension, the pressure at the surface is given by

$$P|_{y=\zeta(t,X)} = -\kappa \nabla_X \cdot \Big(\frac{\nabla_X \zeta}{\sqrt{1+|\nabla_X \zeta|^2}}\Big) \qquad \text{for} \quad t \geq 0, X \in \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{1.6}$$

where $\kappa > 0$ is the surface tension coefficient.

The above problem is known as the water wave problem. Concerning 2-D water wave problem, when surface tension is neglected and the motion of free surface is a small perturbation of still water, one could check Nalimov [16], Yosihara [20] and W. Craig [9]. In general, the local well-posedness of the water wave problem without surface tension was solved by S. Wu [18, 19] in the case of infinite depth and see also Ambrose and Masmoudi [4, 5] for a different proof. More recently, D. Lannes [13] considered the water-wave problem without surface tension in the case of finite depth by working in the Eulerian setting. We should mention some recent results concerning the rotational water wave problem[15, 8, 17, 22].

The purpose of this paper is to study the water wave problem with surface tension and zero surface tension limit in the case of finite depth. Although it seems possible to adapt the method of Ambrose and Masmoudi[4, 5] to the case of finite depth, we choose to work in the Eulerian setting as in [13], since it's the easiest to handle, especially when the asymptotic properties of the solutions are concerned[2, 7]. On the other hand, the water wave problem can be reformulated as a Hamiltonian system in the Eulerian coordinates[21]. To exploit the theory(for example, canonical transformation theory) in the Hamiltonian mechanics, it is natural to use the coordinates in which the water wave problem has a Hamiltonian structure.

1.2. **Presentation of the result.**

As in [13], we use an alternative formulation of the water wave system (1.1)-(1.6). From (1.2) and (1.3), there exsits a potential flow function ϕ such that $V = \nabla_{X,y}\phi$ and

$$\Delta_{X,y}\phi = 0 \qquad \text{in} \quad \Omega_t, \ t \geq 0. \tag{1.7}$$

The boundary conditions (1.4) and (1.5) can be expressed in terms of ϕ

$$\partial_{n_-}\phi|_{y=b(X)} = 0, \qquad \text{for} \quad t>0, \ X \in \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{1.8}$$

and

$$\partial_t \zeta - \sqrt{1+|\nabla_X \zeta|^2}\partial_{n_+}\phi|_{y=\zeta(X)} = 0, \qquad \text{for} \quad t>0, \ X \in \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{1.9}$$

where we denote $\partial_{n_-} := \mathbf{n}_- \cdot \nabla_{X,y}$ and $\partial_{n_+} := \mathbf{n}_+ \cdot \nabla_{X,y}$. The Euler's equation (1.1) can be put into Bernoulli's form

$$\partial_t \phi + \frac{1}{2}|\nabla_{X,y}\phi|^2 + gy = -P \qquad \text{in} \quad \Omega_t, \ t \geq 0. \tag{1.10}$$

We next reduce the system (1.7)-(1.10) to a system where all the functions are evaluated at the free surface only. For this purpose, we introduce the trace of the velocity potential ϕ at the free surface

$$\psi(t,X) := \phi(t,X,\zeta(t,X)),$$

and the (rescaled) Dirichlet-Neumann operator $G(\zeta,b)$(or simply $G(\zeta)$)

$$G(\zeta)\psi := \sqrt{1+|\nabla_X\zeta|^2}\partial_{n_+}\phi|_{y=\zeta(t,X)}.$$

Taking the trace of (1.10) on the free surface, the system (1.7)-(1.10) is equivalent to the system

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t\zeta - G(\zeta)\psi = 0, \\ \partial_t\psi + g\zeta + \frac{1}{2}|\nabla_X\psi|^2 - \frac{(G(\zeta)\psi+\nabla_X\zeta\cdot\nabla_X\psi)^2}{2(1+|\nabla_X\zeta|^2)} = \kappa\nabla_X\cdot(\frac{\nabla_X\zeta}{\sqrt{1+|\nabla_X\zeta|^2}}), \end{cases} \tag{1.11}$$

which is an evolution equation for the height of the free surface $\zeta(t,X)$ and the trace of the velocity potential on the free surface $\psi(t,X)$. Our results in this paper will be given for this system.

We will essentially follow the framework of [13]. It is well-known that Taylor's sign condition is a necessary condition for well-posedness of the water-wave system without surface tension[10, 12]. It is unnecessary for the system with surface tension due to the "smoothing effect" of surface tension. Due to the derivative loss in the system (1.11), we will use Nash-Moser iteration to solve (1.11). The key step is to obtain the well-posedness and the tame estimates of the soluion to the linearized equations of (1.11):

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t V_1 + \nabla_X\cdot(\underline{v}V_1) - \underline{G}V_2 = H_1, \\ \partial_t V_2 + (\underline{a}-\underline{A})V_1 + \underline{v}\cdot\nabla_X V_2 = H_2, \end{cases} \tag{1.12}$$

where $\underline{a},\underline{v}$ are smooth functions, the source terms $(H_1,H_2)\in H^{k+1}\times H^{k+\frac{1}{2}}$, $\underline{G} = G(\underline{\zeta})$ and

$$\underline{A} = \kappa\nabla_X\cdot\Big[\frac{\nabla_X}{\sqrt{1+|\nabla_X\underline{\zeta}|^2}} - \frac{\nabla_X\underline{\zeta}(\nabla_X\underline{\zeta}\cdot\nabla_X)}{(1+|\nabla_X\underline{\zeta}|^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}}\Big].$$

As usual(find a change of unknowns which symmetrizes the system (1.12)), if we try to use the energy functional

$$E_k(V) = (\Lambda^k V_1, -\underline{A}\Lambda^k V_1) + (\Lambda^k V_2, \underline{G}\Lambda^k V_2), \quad \Lambda = (1+|D|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

we have to deal with some singular terms like

$$(\Lambda^k V_2, [\underline{G}, -\underline{A}]\Lambda^k V_1).$$

Note that $V_1\in H^{k+1}$ and $V_2\in H^{k+\frac{1}{2}}$. It seems impossible to control this term by $|V_1|_{H^{k+1}}|V_2|_{H^{k+\frac{1}{2}}}$, since the commutator $[\underline{G},-\underline{A}]$ is an operator of order 2. Fortunately, we find an important fact that the main part of the Dirichlet-Neumann operator $\underline{G}$ is similar to that of the operator $\underline{A}$. Formally, if the main part of $\underline{G}$ is the same as that of the operator $\underline{A}$, we expect that $[\underline{G},-\underline{A}]$ becomes an operator of order 1. In order to use this fact, we need to introduce a more complicated energy functional

$$E_k(V) := (\tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma V_1, \sigma^{-1}(\underline{a} - \underline{A})\sigma^{-1}\tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma V_1) + (\tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma^{-1} V_2,\ \sigma \underline{G}\, \sigma \tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma^{-1} V_2),$$

where

$$\widetilde{\Lambda} = |D|^2 - \frac{\partial_i \underline{\zeta} \partial_j \underline{\zeta}}{1 + |\nabla_X \underline{\zeta}|^2} D_i D_j, \quad \sigma = (1 + |\nabla_X \underline{\zeta}|^2)^{-\frac{1}{4}}.$$

On the other hand, to obtain the tame estimates of the solution, we rely heavily on some sharp pseudo-differential operator estimates obtained in [14].

Now we state our results as follows.

Theorem 1.1. Let $b \in C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. There exists $P > D > 0$ such that for all $\zeta_0 \in H^{s+P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and ψ_0 be such that $\nabla_X \psi_0 \in H^{s+P}(\mathbb{R}^d)^d$, with $s > M$ (M depends on d only). Assume moreover that

$$\min\{\zeta_0 - b, -b\} \geq 2h_0 \qquad \text{on} \quad \mathbb{R}^d \qquad \text{for some} \quad h_0 \geq 0.$$

Then there exist $T > 0$ and a unique solution (ζ, ψ) to the water-wave system (1.11) with the initial condition (ζ_0, ψ_0) and such that $(\zeta, \psi - \psi_0) \in C^1([0,T], H^{s+D}(\mathbb{R}^d) \times H^{s+D}(\mathbb{R}^d))$.

For the flat bottom, we also obtain the zero surface tension limit.

Theorem 1.2. Let $b = -1$ and (ζ_0, ψ_0) satisfy the same assumptions as Theorem 1.1. Assume that the surface tension coefficient κ is sufficiently small. Then there exist $T > 0$ independent of κ and a unique solution $(\zeta^\kappa, \psi^\kappa)$ to (1.11) with $\kappa > 0$ such that $(\zeta^\kappa, \psi^\kappa - \psi_0) \in C^1([0,T], H^{s+D}(\mathbb{R}^d) \times H^{s+D}(\mathbb{R}^d))$. Moreover, as κ tends to zero, the solution $(\zeta^\kappa, \psi^\kappa)$ converges to the solution (ζ, ψ) of (1.11) with $\kappa = 0$.

Remark 1.3. In [13], D. Lannes proved the well-posedness of the water wave problem without surface tension under the following condition on the bottom

$$\Pi_b(V_0|_{y=b(x)}, V_0|_{y=b(x)}) \leq \frac{g}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla_X b|^2}}, \tag{1.13}$$

where Π_b is the second fundamental form of Γ_b, and V_0 is the velocity field associated to ψ_0. In the case of nonzero surface tension, we don't need this extra condition (1.13).

Remark 1.4. Under the condition (1.13), D. Lannes proved the Lévy condition in the case of zero surface tension. However, we don't know whether the Lévy condition still holds for small surface tension under (1.13). This is the reason why we restrict Theorem 1.2 to the case of the flat bottom.

Organization of the paper. In section 2, we prsent a tame elliptic estimate on a strip. In section 3, we review some sharp pseudo-differential operator estimates, and then introduce an important elliptic operator and study its properties. Section 4 is devoted to the study of the Dirichlet-Neumann operator. In section 5, we prove the well-posedness of the linearized water-wave equations and the tame energy estimates of the solution. In section 6, we solve the fully nonlinear equations by using Nash-Moser iteration and study zero surface tension limit.

1.3. **Notation.** We list some notations we will use throughout this paper:

-C denotes some numerical constant which may change from one line to another. If the constant C depends on $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, ...$, we simply denote it by $C(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, ...)$.

-We denote by m_0 the first integer strictly larger then $\frac{d+1}{2}$.

-We write $|\alpha| = \alpha_1 + ... + \alpha_{d+1}$ with $\alpha = (\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_{d+1})$.

-We denote $\partial_i = \partial_{X_i}$, for $i = 1, ..., d$, $\partial_{d+1} = \partial_y$, and for $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{d+1}, \partial^\alpha = {\partial_1}^{\alpha_1} ... {\partial_{d+1}}^{\alpha_{d+1}}$.

-We denote by $C_b^k(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the set of bounded and continuous on $\mathbb{R}^d$ functions together with their derivatives of order less than or equal to k. We also denote $C_b^\infty = \cap_k C_b^k$.

-We denote by $(\cdot, \cdot)$ the usual real scalar product on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

-We denote by $\Lambda = \Lambda(D)$ the Fourier multiplier with the symbol $\Lambda(\xi) = (1 + |\xi|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

-We denote by $H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the Sobolev space with norm $|f|_{H^s} := (\int \Lambda(\xi)^{2s} |\hat{f}(\xi)|^2 d\xi)^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

-We denote $|f|_{H^s_T} = \sup_{t\in[0,T]} |f(t)|_{H^s}$, when $f \in C([0,T], H^s)$.

-We denote $|F|_B = |f_1|_B + ... + |f_n|_B$, where $F = (f_1, ..., f_n)$, B is a Banach space, and $F \in B^n$.

-For an open set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ we denote by $\|\cdot : U\|_p$, $\|\cdot : U\|_{k,\infty}$, and $\|\cdot : U\|_{k,2}$ the norms of $L^p(U)$, $W^{k,\infty}(U)$ and $H^k(U)$ respectively. When no confusion can be made we omit U.

2. Elliptic boundary value problem on a strip

Assume that $\Omega = \{(X, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}, b(X) < y < a(X)\}$, where $a(X)$ and $b(X)$ satisfy

$$\exists h_0 > 0, \quad \text{s.t. on } \mathbb{R}^d, \ \min\{-b(X), a(X) - b(X)\} \geq h_0. \tag{2.1}$$

We study the boundary value problem of the form

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{X,y} u = h & \text{on} \quad \Omega, \\ u|_{y=a(X)} = f, \ \partial_{n_-} u|_{y=b(X)} = g \end{cases}$$

where h is a function defined on Ω, f, g are functions defined on $\mathbb{R}^d$, and $\partial_{n_-} u|_{y=b(X)}$ denotes the normal derivative of u at the boundary $y = b(X)$.

We denote by $\mathcal{S} = \mathbb{R}^d \times (-1, 0)$ a flat strip. We denote by S a diffeomorphism from $\mathcal{S}$ to Ω, which is of the form

$$S : \begin{array}{l} \mathcal{S} \longrightarrow \Omega \\ (\tilde{X}, \tilde{y}) \mapsto (\tilde{X}, s(\tilde{X}, \tilde{y})), \end{array}$$

where $s(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{y}) = -b(\widetilde{X})\widetilde{y} + (1 + \widetilde{y})a(\widetilde{X})$.

Using the diffeomorphism S, the elliptic equation $-\Delta_{X,y} u = 0$ on Ω can be equivalently formulated as a variable coefficients equation $\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}\widetilde{u} = 0$ on $\mathcal{S}$. More precisely,

Lemma 2.1. The elliptic equation $-\Delta_{X,y} u = h$ holds in $\mathcal{D}'(\Omega)$ if and only if the equation $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}\tilde{u} = (a-b)\tilde{h}$ holds in $\mathcal{D}'(\mathcal{S})$, where $\tilde{u} = u \circ S$ and $\tilde{h} = h \circ S$, and $\tilde{\mathbf{P}} := -\nabla_{X,y} \cdot \tilde{P} \nabla_{X,y}$, with

$$\tilde{P} = \frac{1}{a-b} \begin{pmatrix} (a-b)^2 I_{d\times d} & (b-a)\nabla_{\widetilde{X}} s \\ (b-a)\nabla_{\widetilde{X}} s^T & 1 + |\nabla_{\widetilde{X}} s|^2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \nabla_{\widetilde{X}} s = -\nabla_{\widetilde{X}} b \widetilde{y} + (1+\widetilde{y}) \nabla_{\widetilde{X}} a.$$

Moreover, one has for all $\Theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$,

$$\tilde{P}\Theta \cdot \Theta \geq \tilde{p}|\Theta|^2, \qquad \text{with} \quad \tilde{p} = C \frac{h_0^2}{\|a-b\|_\infty (1 + \|(\nabla_{\tilde{X}} a, \nabla_{\tilde{X}} b)\|_\infty^2)}.$$

The following tame estimate of the coefficient matrix $\widetilde{P}$ will be frequently used in the subsequence: for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\|\widetilde{P}\|_{k,2} \leq C(h_0, |b|_{W^{k+1,\infty}}, |a|_{H^{m_0+1}}) |a|_{H^{k+1}}, \tag{2.2}$$

which can be deduced by using Hölder inequality and interpolation argument (see also Appendix A in [13]).

We next present the tame elliptic estimate of the following variable coefficients elliptic equation:

$$\begin{cases} \widetilde{\mathbf{P}} u := -\nabla_{X,y} \cdot \widetilde{P} \nabla_{X,y} u = h \qquad \text{on} \quad \mathcal{S}, \\ u|_{y=0} = f, \quad \partial_n^{\widetilde{P}} u|_{y=-1} = g, \end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

where $\partial_n^{\widetilde{P}}$ denotes the conormal derivative associated to $\widetilde{P}$

$$\partial_n^{\widetilde{P}} u|_{y=-1} = e_{d+1} \cdot \widetilde{P} \nabla_{X,y} u|_{y=-1}.$$

Proposition 2.2. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $f \in H^{k+\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $g \in H^{k+\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $h \in H^k(\mathcal{S})$. If $b \in W^{k+2,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $a \in H^{k+2} \cap H^{2m_0+2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, there exists a unique solution $u \in H^{k+2}(\mathcal{S})$ to (2.3). Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{k+2,2} \quad \leq \quad & C_k (\|h\|_{k,2} + |f|_{H^{k+\frac{3}{2}}} + |g|_{H^{k+\frac{1}{2}}}) \\ & + C_k (\|h\|_{m_0-1,2} + |f|_{H^{m_0+\frac{1}{2}}} + |g|_{H^{m_0-\frac{1}{2}}}) |a|_{H^{k+2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $C_k = C(\widetilde{p}, |b|_{W^{k+2,\infty}}, |a|_{H^{2m_0+2}})$.

Proof. This is a direct corollary of (2.2) and Theorem 2.9 in [13] . $\square$

3. SHARP PSEUDO-DIFFERENTIAL OPERATOR ESTIMATES

Let us firstly recall some tame pseudo-differential operator estimates from [14] which play an important role in the energy estimates.

Definition 3.1. Let $m \in \mathbb{R}$, $p \in \mathbb{N}$ and let Σ be a function defined over $\mathbb{R}_v^p \times \mathbb{R}_\xi^d$. We say that $\Sigma \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^p, \mathcal{M}^m)$ if

(1) $\Sigma|_{\mathbb{R}^p \times \{|\xi| \leq 1\}} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^p; L^\infty(|\xi| \leq 1))$;

(2) for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^p, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^d$, there exists a nondecreasing function $C_{\alpha,\beta}(\cdot)$ such that

$$\sup_{|\xi| \geq \frac{1}{4}} (1 + |\xi|^2)^{(|\beta|-m)/2} \left| \partial_v^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta \Sigma(v, \xi) \right| \leq C_{\alpha,\beta}(|v|).$$

We say that $\Sigma \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^p, \mathcal{M}^m)$ is k-regular at the origin if $\Sigma|_{\mathbb{R}^p \times \{|\xi| \le 1\}} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^p; W^{k,\infty}(\{|\xi| \le 1\}))$.

We have the following tame pseudo-differential operator estimates:

Proposition 3.2. Let $m \in \mathbb{R}$, $p \in \mathbb{N}$ and $d/2 < t_0 \le s_0$. Assume that $\sigma(x,\xi) = \Sigma(v(x),\xi)$ with $\Sigma \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^p, \mathcal{M}^m)$ and $v \in H^{s_0}(\mathbb{R}^d)^p$. Then there hold for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\max\{-t_0, -t_0 - m_1\} < s \le s_0 + 1$

$$\begin{aligned} &|\sigma(x,D)u|_{H^s} < C_\Sigma(|v|_\infty)|v|_{H^{t_0}}|u|_{H^{s+m}}, \quad \forall -t_0 < s < t_0, \\ &|\sigma(x,D)u|_{H^s} < C_\Sigma(|v|_\infty)(|v|_{H^s}|u|_{H^{m+t_0}} + |u|_{H^{s+m}}), \quad \forall\, t_0 \le s \le s_0. \end{aligned}$$

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we define $\sigma_1 \sharp_n \sigma_2$ as

$$\sigma_1 \sharp_n \sigma_2(x,\xi) = \sum_{|\alpha| \le n} \frac{(-i)^{|\alpha|}}{\alpha!} \partial_\xi^\alpha \sigma_1(x,\xi) \partial_x^\alpha \sigma_2(x,\xi)$$

and the Poisson bracket $\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}_n$ as

$$\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}_n = \sigma_1 \sharp_n \sigma_2(x,\xi) - \sigma_2 \sharp_n \sigma_1(x,\xi).$$

We have the following tame composition and commutator estimates:

Proposition 3.3. Let m_1, $m_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, $m := m_1 \wedge m_2$, and $d/2 < t_0 \le s_0$. Let $\sigma^j(x,\xi) = \Sigma^j(v_j(x),\xi)$ with $p^j \in \mathbb{N}$, $\Sigma^j \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{p_j}, \mathcal{M}^{m_j})$ and $v_j \in H^{s_0+m\wedge n+1}(\mathbb{R}^d)^{p_j}$ $(j = 1,2)$. Assume moreover that Σ^1 and Σ^2 are n-regular at the origin. Then for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\min\{-t_0, -t_0 - m_1, -t_0 - m_2\} \le s \le s_0 + 1$ the following holds (writing $v := (v_1, v_2)$)

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathrm{Op}(\sigma^1) \circ \mathrm{Op}(\sigma^2)u - \mathrm{Op}(\sigma^1 \#_n \sigma^2)u|_{H^s} &\le C(|v|_{W^{n+1,\infty}})\big[|u|_{H^{s+m_1+m_2-n-1}} \\ &+ (|v^1|_{H^{t_0+1}}|v^2|_{H^{s_+ + m\wedge n}} + |v^2|_{H^{t_0+1}}|v^1|_{H^{s_+ + m\wedge n}})|u|_{H^{m+t_0}}\big]. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, one has

$$\begin{aligned} |[\mathrm{Op}(\sigma^1),\ \mathrm{Op}(\sigma^2)]u - \mathrm{Op}(\{\sigma^1,\ \sigma^2\}_n)u|_{H^s} &\le C(|v|_{W^{n+1,\infty}})\big[|u|_{H^{s+m_1+m_2-n-1}} \\ &+ (|v^1|_{H^{t_0+1}}|v^2|_{H^{s_+ + m\wedge n}} + |v^2|_{H^{t_0+1}}|v^1|_{H^{s_+ + m\wedge n}})|u|_{H^{m+t_0}}\big]. \end{aligned}$$

Here $s_+ := \max\{s, 0\}$, $m \wedge n := \max\{m, n\}$.

Remark 3.4. If the symbol $\sigma = \Sigma(v(X,y),\xi)$ and $u = u(X,y)$ for $(X,y) \in \mathcal{S}, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$, Prop. 3.2 and 3.3 with $H^k(\mathbb{R}^d)$ norm replaced by $H^k(\mathcal{S})$ norm still remain true. We only need to notice the following two facts: Firstly, since $\mathcal{S}$ is a flat strip, there exists a linear extension operator $E : H^k(\mathcal{S}) \to H^k(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ such that(see [1])

$$\begin{aligned} &Eu(X,y) = u(X,y), \quad \text{a.e. } (X,y) \in \mathcal{S} \quad \text{and} \\ &\|Eu\|_{H^k(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})} \le C\|u\|_{H^k(\mathcal{S})}. \end{aligned}$$

Secondly,

$$\widetilde{\sigma}(X,y,D)(Eu)(X,y) = \sigma(X,y,D)u(X,y), \quad \text{a.e. } (X,y) \in \mathcal{S},$$

where $\widetilde{\sigma}(X,y,\xi) = \Sigma((Ev)(X,y),\xi)$.

We next introduce an elliptic differential operator Λ_a defined by

$$\Lambda_a = |D|^2 - \frac{\partial_i a \partial_j a}{1+|\nabla_X a|^2} D_i D_j, \quad D_j = \frac{\partial_j}{i},\ a \in H^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$$

which will appear in the energy functional. Later, we will find that the operator Λ_a is similar to the main part of the Dirichlet-Neumann operator $G(a,b)$. Here the repeated index denotes the summation. In what follows, we denote by $C_k(s)$ a constant depending on k and $|a|_{H^s}$.

Lemma 3.5. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}, s \geq 0, f \in H^{2k+s} \cap H^{m_0}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then there holds

$$|\Lambda_a^k f|_{H^s} \leq C_k(m_0+1)\big(|f|_{H^{2k+s}} + |f|_{H^{m_0}} |\nabla_X a|_{H^{2k+s}}\big).$$

Proof. Since lemma can be easily proved by using Hölder inequality and interpolation argument(see Appendix A in [13]), we omit its proof here. □

Lemma 3.6. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}, s \in [0,1], f \in H^{2k+s} \cap H^{m_0}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then there holds

$$|\Lambda_a^k f|_{H^s} \geq C_k(m_0+2)^{-1}|f|_{H^{2k+s}} - C_k(m_0+2)(1+|\nabla_X a|_{H^{2k+s}})|f|_{H^{m_0}}.$$

Proof. We use an inductive argument on k. Let us firstly prove the case of $k=1$. We can rewrite Λ_a as

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda_a &= [\delta_{ij} - (1+|\nabla_X a|^2)^{-1}\partial_i a \partial_j a] D_i D_j \\ &\triangleq g_{ij}(\nabla_X a) D_i D_j.\end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}(\Lambda_a f, f) &= -(g_{ij}(\nabla_X a)\partial_i\partial_j f, f) \\ &= (g_{ij}(\nabla_X a)\partial_i f, \partial_j f) + (\partial_j g_{ij}(\nabla_X a)\partial_i f, f) \\ &\geq C(m_0+1)^{-1}|\nabla f|_{L^2}^2 - C(m_0+2)|f|_{L^2}|\nabla f|_{L^2} \\ &\geq C(m_0+1)^{-1}|f|_{H^1}^2 - C(m_0+2)|f|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}|(\Lambda_a \nabla_X f, \nabla_X f)| &\leq |(\nabla_X \Lambda_a f, \nabla_X f)| + |((\nabla_X g_{ij}) D_i D_j f, \nabla_X f)| \\ &\leq (|\Lambda_a f|_{L^2} + C(m_0+2)|f|_{H^1})|\nabla_X f|_{H^1},\end{aligned}$$

which together with (3.1) gives

$$\begin{aligned}&C(m_0+1)^{-1}|\nabla_X f|_{H^1}^2 \leq (\Lambda_a \nabla_X f, \nabla_X f) + C(m_0+2)|\nabla_X f|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq \frac{C(m_0+1)^{-1}}{2}|\nabla_X f|_{H^1}^2 + C(m_0+2)|\Lambda_a f|_{L^2}^2 + C(m_0+2)|f|_{L^2}^2.\end{aligned}$$

That is,

$$|\Lambda_a f|_{L^2} \geq C(m_0+2)^{-1}|f|_{H^2} - C(m_0+2)|f|_{L^2}, \tag{3.2}$$

from which and Kato-Ponce commutator estimate, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}|\Lambda_a f|_{H^s} &\geq |\Lambda_a \Lambda^s f|_{L^2} - |[\Lambda^s, g_{ij}] D_i D_j f|_{L^2} \\ &\geq C(m_0+2)^{-1}|f|_{H^{2+s}} - C(m_0+2)|f|_{H^s} \\ &\quad -C(m_0+2)(|\nabla_X a|_{H^{2+s}}|f|_{H^{m_0}} + |f|_{H^2}).\end{aligned}$$

Again, by (3.2) we get

$$|\Lambda_a f|_{H^s} \geq C(m_0+2)^{-1}|f|_{H^{2+s}} - C(m_0+2)(1+|\nabla_X a|_{H^{2+s}})|f|_{H^{m_0}}. \qquad (3.3)$$

Now let us inductively assume that for $1 \leq l \leq k-1$

$$|\Lambda_a^l f|_{H^s} \geq C_l(m_0+2)^{-1}|f|_{H^{2l+s}} - C_l(m_0+2)(1+|\nabla_X a|_{H^{2l+s}})|f|_{H^{m_0}}. \qquad (3.4)$$

Then we get by the induction assumption that

$$\begin{aligned}|\Lambda_a^k f|_{H^s} = |\Lambda_a^{k-1}\Lambda_a f|_{H^s} &\geq C_k(m_0+2)^{-1}|\Lambda_a f|_{H^{2(k-1)+s}} \\ &\quad - C_k(m_0+2)(1+|\nabla_X a|_{H^{2(k-1)+s}})|\Lambda_a f|_{H^{m_0}}). \qquad (3.5)\end{aligned}$$

While by (3.3) and Kato-Ponce commutator estimate, we have that for any $|\alpha| = 2(k-1)$

$$\begin{aligned}|\partial^\alpha \Lambda_a f|_{H^s} &\geq |\Lambda_a \partial^\alpha f|_{H^s} - |[\partial^\alpha, g_{ij}]D_iD_j f|_{H^s} \\ &\geq C(m_0+2)^{-1}|f|_{H^{2k+s}} - C(m_0+2)|f|_{H^{2(k-1)}} \\ &\quad - C_k(m_0+2)(|\nabla_X a|_{H^{2k+s}}|f|_{H^{m_0}} + |f|_{H^{2k-1+s}}),\end{aligned}$$

and by interpolation,

$$C_k(m_0+2)|f|_{H^{2k-1+s}} \leq \frac{1}{2}C(m_0+2)^{-1}|f|_{H^{2k+s}} + \widetilde{C}_k(m_0+2)|f|_{H^{m_0}},$$

which together with (3.4) and (3.5) imply the lemma. □

Similarly, we can also obtain

Lemma 3.7. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}, s \in [0,1], f \in H^{2k+s} \cap H^{m_0}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then there holds

$$|\sigma_a \Lambda_a^k \sigma_a^{-1} f|_{H^s} \geq C_k(m_0+2)^{-1}|f|_{H^{2k+s}} - C_k(m_0+2)(1+|\nabla_X a|_{H^{2k+s}})|f|_{H^{m_0}}.$$

A similar estimate also holds for $|\sigma_a^{-1}\Lambda_a^k \sigma_a f|_{H^s}$. Here $\sigma_a = (1+|\nabla_X a|^2)^{-\frac{1}{4}}$.

In the energy estimates, we need to deal with the following commutator

$$[\mathcal{P}_a, \Lambda_a^k] = \mathcal{P}_a\Lambda_a^k - \Lambda_a^k\mathcal{P}_a,$$

where the operator $\mathcal{P}_a$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{P}_a = (\sigma_a \nabla_X \sigma_a^{-1}\cdot)^2 - \Big(\frac{\nabla_X a \cdot \nabla_X \sigma_a^{-1}\cdot}{(1+|\nabla_X a|^2)^{\frac{3}{4}}}\Big)^2.$$

By a simple calculation, we find that the operator $\mathcal{P}_a$ can be written as

$$\mathcal{P}_a f = -\Lambda_a f + h_1(\nabla_X a, \nabla_X^2 a)\nabla_X f + h_2(\nabla_X a, \nabla_X^2 a, \nabla_X^3 a) f, \qquad (3.6)$$

for some two smooth functions h_1, h_2. So, we arrive at

Lemma 3.8. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}, s \in [0,1], f \in H^{2k+s} \cap H^{m_0}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then there holds

$$|[\mathcal{P}_a, \Lambda_a^k]f|_{H^s} \leq C_k(m_0+4)(|f|_{H^{2k+s}} + |\nabla_X a|_{H^{2(k+1)+s}}|f|_{H^{m_0}}).$$

Proof. By (3.6), we have

$$[\mathcal{P}_a, \Lambda_a^k]f = [h_1\nabla_X, \Lambda_a^k]f + [h_2, \Lambda_a^k]f.$$

Firstly, we get by Lemma 3.5 that

$$\begin{aligned} |[h_2, \Lambda_a^k]f|_{H^s} &\le |h_2\Lambda_a^k f|_{H^s} + |\Lambda_a^k(h_2 f)|_{H^s} \\ &\le C_k(m_0+4)(|f|_{H^{2k+s}} + |\nabla_X a|_{H^{2(k+1)+s}}|f|_{H^{m_0}}). \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

While,

$$\begin{aligned} &[h_1\nabla_X, \Lambda_a^k]f = (h_1\nabla_X\Lambda_a^k f - h_1\Lambda_a^k\nabla_X f) + (h_1\Lambda_a^k\nabla_X f - \Lambda_a^k h_1\nabla_X f) \\ &= h_1 \sum_{\substack{\sum_{l=1}^k |\alpha_l|+|\beta|=2k+1 \\ |\beta|\le 2k}} C_{\alpha,\beta}\prod_{l=1}^k D^{\alpha_l} g_{i_l j_l}(\nabla_X a) D^\beta f \\ &\quad + \sum_{\sum_{l=1}^k |\alpha_l|+|\beta|=2k} C'_{\alpha,\beta}\prod_{l=1}^k D^{\alpha_l} g_{i_l j_l}(\nabla_X a)\Big[\sum_{\substack{\beta_1+\beta_2=\beta \\ |\beta_2|<|\beta|}} C_{\beta_1,\beta_2} D^{\beta_1} h_1 D^{\beta_2}\nabla_X f\Big], \end{aligned}$$

from which, we get by using Hölder inequality and interpolation argument that

$$|[h_1\nabla_X, \Lambda_a^k]f|_{H^s} \le C_k(m_0+2)(|f|_{H^{2k+s}} + |\nabla_X a|_{H^{2(k+1)+s}}|f|_{H^{m_0}}). \tag{3.8}$$

Summing up (3.7) and (3.8), we conclude the lemma. □

4. THE DIRICHLET-NEUMANN OPERATOR

Assume that the fluid domain Ω is of the form

$$\Omega = \{(X,y) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}, b(X) < y < a(X)\}$$

where $a(X)$ and $b(X)$ satisfy (2.1). We consider the boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = 0 & \text{on } \Omega \\ u|_{y=a(X)} = f, & \partial_{n_-} u|_{y=b(X)} = 0. \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

Definition 4.1. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and $a, b \in W^{2,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfy the condition (2.1). We define the Dirichlet-Neumann operator to be the operator $G(a,b)$ given by

$$G(a,b) : \begin{array}{ccc} H^{k+\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^d) & \to & H^{k+\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^d) \\ f & \mapsto & \sqrt{1+|\nabla_X a|^2}\,\partial_{n_+} u|_{y=a(X)}, \end{array}$$

where u is the solution of (4.1).

As in section 2, we can associate the elliptic problem (4.1) on Ω to a problem on a strip $\mathcal{S}$:

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{\mathbf{P}}\tilde{u} = 0 & \text{on } \mathcal{S}, \\ \tilde{u}|_{\tilde{y}=0} = f, & \partial_n^{\tilde{P}}\tilde{u}|_{\tilde{y}=-1} = 0. \end{cases} \tag{4.2}$$

We denote by f^b the solution of (4.2). Then we have

$$G(a,b)f = -\partial_n^{\tilde{P}} f^b|_{\tilde{y}=0}, \quad \forall f \in H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

In what follows, we firstly recall some properties of the Dirichlet-Neumann operator from [13]. Let us introduce some notations. When a bottom parameterization $b \in W^{k,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is given, we write $B = |b|_{W^{k,\infty}}$. For all $r, s \in \mathbb{R}$, we denote by $M(s)$(resp. $M_r(s)$) constants which depend on B and $|a|_{H^s}$(resp. r, B and $|a|_{H^s}$).

Proposition 4.2. Assume that a, b satisfy (2.1). Then there hold
i. For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, if $a, b \in W^{k+2,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then for all f such that $\nabla_X f \in H^{k+\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^d)^2$, one has

$$|G(a,b)f|_{H^{k+\frac{1}{2}}} \leq C(|a|_{W^{k+2,\infty}}, |b|_{W^{k+2,\infty}})|\nabla_X f|_{H^{k+\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

ii. For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, if $a \in H^{2m_0+\frac{1}{2}} \cap H^{k+\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and if $b \in W^{k+2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then

$$|G(a,b)f|_{H^{k+\frac{1}{2}}} \leq M_k(2m_0 + \frac{1}{2})(|\nabla_X f|_{H^{k+\frac{1}{2}}} + |a|_{H^{k+\frac{3}{2}}}|\nabla_X f|_{H^{m_0+\frac{1}{2}}}),$$

for all f such that $\nabla_X f \in H^{k+\frac{1}{2}} \cap H^{m_0+\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Proposition 4.3. Let $a, b \in W^{2,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfy (2.1). Then there hold
i. The operator G is self-adjoint:

$$(G(a,b)f, g) = (f, G(a,b)g), \quad \forall f, g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d);$$

ii. The operator is positive:

$$(G(a,b)f, f) \geq 0, \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d);$$

iii. We have the estimates for $f, g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$:

$$|(G(a,b)f, g)| \leq M(m_0 + \frac{1}{2})|f|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}|g|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}};$$
$$|([G(a,b) + \mu]f, f)| \geq C\tilde{p}|f|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}},$$

for all $\mu \geq \frac{2\tilde{p}}{3}$, where $\tilde{p}$ is given in Lemma 2.1.

Define the operator

$$R_a = G(a,b) - g_a(X,D),$$

where $g_a(X,D)$ is a pseudo-differential operator with the symbol

$$g_a(X,\xi) = \sqrt{(1 + |\nabla_X a|^2)|\xi|^2 - (\xi \cdot \nabla_X a)^2}.$$

We have the following tame estimate for R_a:

Proposition 4.4. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}, f \in H^{k+\frac{1}{2}} \cap H^{m_0+1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then there holds

$$|R_a f|_{H^{k+\frac{1}{2}}} \leq M_k(2m_0 + 2)(|f|_{H^{k+\frac{1}{2}}} + |f|_{H^{m_0+1}}|a|_{H^{k+3}}).$$

Remark 4.5. The case when $k = 0, -1$ was proved in [13]. To obtain the tame estimate for general k, we need to use the approximate solution of (4.2) constructed in [13] and the tame pseudo-differential operator estimates from [14]. Proposition 4.4 also tells us that $g_a(X,D)$ is the main part of the Dirichlet-Neumann operator $G(a,b)$.

Let us firstly recall the approximate solution of (4.2) constructed in [13]. Write $\widetilde{P}$ given by Lemma 2.1 as

$$\tilde{P} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{P}_1 & \tilde{\mathbf{p}} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{p}}^T & \tilde{p}_{d+1} \end{pmatrix},$$

i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{P}} &= -\tilde{p}_{d+1}\partial_{\tilde{y}}^2 - (2\tilde{\mathbf{p}}\cdot\nabla_X + (\partial_{\tilde{y}}\tilde{p}_{d+1} + \nabla_X\cdot\tilde{\mathbf{p}}))\partial_{\tilde{y}} \\ &\quad -P_1\Delta_X - ((\nabla_X\cdot P_1) + \partial_{\tilde{y}}\tilde{\mathbf{p}})\cdot\nabla_X. \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_{app} = -\tilde{p}_{d+1}(\partial_{\tilde{y}} - \eta_-(X,\tilde{y},D))(\partial_{\tilde{y}} - \eta_+(X,\tilde{y},D))$$

where $\eta_\pm(X,\tilde{y},D)$ are pseudo-differential operators with symbols

$$\eta_\pm(X,\tilde{y},\xi) = \frac{1}{\tilde{p}_{d+1}}\Big(-i\tilde{\mathbf{p}}\cdot\xi \pm \sqrt{\tilde{p}_{d+1}\xi\cdot\tilde{P}_1\xi - (\tilde{\mathbf{p}}\cdot\xi)^2}\Big), \quad \widetilde{y}\in[-1,0].$$

Moreover, η_+ satisfies

$$\frac{\|\widetilde{P}\|_\infty}{\widetilde{p}}|\xi| \geq \mathrm{Re}(\eta_+(X,\widetilde{y},\xi)) \geq C_+|\xi|,$$

where C_+ is a positive constant depending on $h_0, p, |b|_{1,\infty}$ and $|\nabla_X a|_{H^{m_0}}$. Therefore, there exist functions $\Sigma_\pm(v,\xi)\in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{(d+1)^2},\mathcal{M}^1)$ 1-regular at the origin such that $\eta_\pm(X,\tilde{y},\xi) = \Sigma_\pm(\widetilde{P}(X,\widetilde{y}),\xi)$.

The approximate solution f^b_{app} of (4.2) is defined as follows

$$f^b_{app}(X,\widetilde{y}) = \sigma_{app}(X,\widetilde{y},D)f, \tag{4.3}$$

where $\sigma_{app}(X,\widetilde{y},\xi) = \exp(-\int_{\widetilde{y}}^0 \eta_+(X,y',\xi)dy')$. We know from [13] that

$$g_a(X,D)f = -\partial_n^{\tilde{P}} f^b_{app}|_{\tilde{y}=0}. \tag{4.4}$$

Proof of Proposition 4.4. By the definition of $G(a,b)$ and (4.4), we have

$$R_a f = -\partial_n^{\tilde{P}}(f^b - f^b_{app})|_{\tilde{y}=0} \triangleq -\partial_n^{\tilde{P}} f^b_r|_{\tilde{y}=0},$$

where $f^b_r = f^b - f^b_{app}$. We use the trace theorem and (2.2) to get

$$\begin{aligned} |R_a f|_{H^{k+\frac12}} &= |e_{d+1}\cdot\tilde{P}\nabla_{X,\tilde{y}} f^b_r|_{\tilde{y}=0}|_{H^{k+\frac12}} \leq C_k\|\tilde{P}\nabla_{X,\tilde{y}} f^b_r\|_{H^{k,2}} \\ &\leq M_k(m_0+1)(\|f^b_r\|_{k+2,2} + |a|_{H^{k+2}}\|f^b_r\|_{m_0+1,2}). \end{aligned}$$

We next turn to the tame estimate of $\|f^b_r\|_{k+2,2}$. From the proof of Lemma 3.14 in [13], we find that

$$\tilde{\mathbf{P}} f^b_r = -(\tilde{\mathbf{P}} - \tilde{\mathbf{P}}_{app})f^b_{app} - \tilde{\mathbf{P}}_{app} f^b_{app} := h^1_{app} + h^2_{app},$$

together with the boundary condition

$$f^b_r|_{\widetilde{y}=0} = 0, \qquad \partial_n^{\widetilde{P}} f^b_r|_{\widetilde{y}=-1} = -\partial_n^{\widetilde{P}} f^b_{app}|_{\widetilde{y}=-1}.$$

From Prop. 2.2, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\|f_r^b\|_{k+2,2} \le M_k(2m_0+2)(\|h^1_{app}\|_{k,2} + \|h^2_{app}\|_{k,2} + |\partial_n^{\tilde{P}} f^b_{app}|_{\tilde{y}=-1}|_{H^{k+\frac12}})\\ +M_k(2m_0+2)(\|h^1_{app}\|_{m_0-1,2} + \|h^2_{app}\|_{m_0-1,2} + |\partial_n^{\tilde{P}} f^b_{app}|_{\tilde{y}=-1}|_{H^{m_0-\frac12}})|a|_{H^{k+2}}.\end{aligned}$$

Now it remains to estimate the right hand side of the above inequality.

Step 1. Estimate of h^1_{app}.

We set

$$\begin{aligned}&\tau_1(X,\tilde{y},D) = \eta_-(X,\tilde{y},D)\circ\eta_+(X,\tilde{y},D) - (\eta_-\eta_+)(X,\tilde{y},D),\\ &\tau_2(X,\tilde{y},D) = (\partial_{\tilde{y}}\eta_+)(X,\tilde{y},D).\end{aligned}$$

Then we find that

$$\begin{aligned}&\tilde{\mathbf{P}} - \tilde{\mathbf{P}}_{app} - \tilde{p}_{d+1}\tau_1 + \tilde{p}_{d+1}\tau_2\\ &\quad = (\partial_{\tilde{y}}\tilde{p}_{d+1} + \nabla_X\cdot\tilde{\mathbf{p}})\partial_{\tilde{y}} - (\nabla_X\cdot\tilde{P}_1 + \partial_{\tilde{y}}\tilde{\mathbf{p}})\cdot\nabla_X.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|(\tilde{\mathbf{P}} - \tilde{\mathbf{P}}_{app})u\|_{k,2} \le \|[(\partial_{\tilde{y}}\widetilde{p}_{d+1} + \nabla_X\cdot\tilde{\mathbf{p}})\partial_{\tilde{y}} - (\nabla_X\cdot\tilde{P}_1 + \partial_{\tilde{y}}\tilde{\mathbf{p}})\cdot\nabla_X]u\|_{k,2}\\ +\|\tilde{p}_{d+1}\tau_1(X,\tilde{y},D)u\|_{k,2} + \|\tilde{p}_{d+1}\tau_2(X,\tilde{y},D)u\|_{k,2}.\end{aligned}$$

By (2.2), the first term of the right hand side is bounded by

$$M_k(m_0+2)(\|u\|_{k+1,2} + |a|_{H^{k+2}}\|u\|_{m_0+1,2}).$$

By Prop. 3.2-3.3 and (2.2), the other two terms are bounded by

$$M_k(m_0+2)(\|u\|_{k+1,2} + |a|_{H^{k+2}}\|u\|_{m_0+1,2}).$$

So we get

$$\|(\tilde{\mathbf{P}} - \tilde{\mathbf{P}}_{app})u\|_{k,2} \le M_k(m_0+2)(\|u\|_{k+1,2} + |a|_{H^{k+2}}\|u\|_{m_0+1,2}),$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned}&\|h^1_{app}\|_{k,2} = \|(\tilde{\mathbf{P}} - \tilde{\mathbf{P}}_{app})\widetilde{\sigma}_{app}(X,\widetilde{y},D)\exp(\frac{C_+}{2}\tilde{y}|D|)f\|_{k,2}\\ &\le M_k(m_0+2)\|\widetilde{\sigma}_{app}(X,\widetilde{y},D)\exp(\frac{C_+}{2}\tilde{y}|D|)f\|_{k+1,2}\\ &\qquad +M_k(m_0+2)\|\widetilde{\sigma}_{app}(X,\widetilde{y},D)\exp(\frac{C_+}{2}\tilde{y}|D|)f\|_{m_0+1,2}|a|_{H^{k+2}}, \qquad (4.5)\end{aligned}$$

where $\widetilde{\sigma}_{app}(X,\widetilde{y},D) = \sigma_{app}(X,\widetilde{y},D)\exp(-\frac{C_+}{2}\tilde{y}|D|)$ is a pseudo-differential operator of order 0. By Prop. 3.2, we get

$$\|\widetilde{\sigma}_{app}u\|_{k+1,2} \le M_k(m_0+1)(\|u\|_{k+1,2} + \|u\|_{m_0,2}|a|_{H^{k+2}}),$$

which together with (4.5) gives

$$\|h^1_{app}\|_{k,2} \le M_k(m_0+2)(|f|_{H^{k+\frac12}} + |f|_{H^{m_0+\frac12}}|a|_{H^{k+2}}), \qquad (4.6)$$

where we used the fact that

$$\|\exp(\frac{C_+}{2}\tilde{y}|D|)f\|_{k+1,2} \le C_k|f|_{H^{k+\frac12}}. \qquad (4.7)$$

Step 2. Estimate of h^2_{app}. By the definition, we have

$$\|h^2_{app}\|_{k,2} = \|\tilde{p}_{d+1}(\partial_{\tilde{y}} - \eta_-(X,\tilde{y},D))\tau_3(X,\tilde{y},D)\exp(\frac{C_+}{2}\tilde{y}|D|)f\|_{k,2}.$$

where

$$\tau_3(X,\tilde{y},D) = (\eta_+\tilde{\sigma}_{app})(X,\tilde{y},D) - \eta_+ \circ \tilde{\sigma}_{app}(X,\tilde{y},D).$$

We get by Prop. 3.2 and (2.2) that

$$\|(\partial_{\tilde{y}} - \eta_-(X,\tilde{y},D))u\|_{k,2} \le M_k(m_0+1)(\|u\|_{k+1,2} + \|u\|_{m_0+1}|a|_{H^{k+1}}),$$

and by Prop. 3.3 and (2.2)

$$\|\tau_3(X,\tilde{y},D)u\|_{k+1,2} \le M_k(m_0+2)(\|u\|_{k+1,2} + \|u\|_{m_0+1}|a|_{H^{k+3}}),$$

from which and (4.7), it follows that

$$\|h^2_{app}\|_{k,2} \le M_k(m_0+2)(|f|_{H^{k+\frac{1}{2}}} + |f|_{H^{m_0+\frac{1}{2}}}|a|_{H^{k+3}}). \tag{4.8}$$

Step 3. Estimate of $\partial_n^{\tilde{P}} f^b_{app}|_{\tilde{y}=-1}$. We rewrite it as

$$\partial_n^{\tilde{P}} f^b_{app}|_{\tilde{y}=-1} = e_{d+1}\cdot \tilde{P}|_{\tilde{y}=-1}B(X,D)f + e_{d+1}\cdot \tilde{P}|_{\tilde{y}=-1}\begin{pmatrix} \tau_4(X,-1,D) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} f,$$

where

$$\tau_4(X,\tilde{y},D) = \nabla_X\sigma_{app}(X,\tilde{y},D) - (i\xi\sigma_{app})(X,\tilde{y},D),$$
$$B(X,D) = [\begin{pmatrix} i\xi \\ \eta_+(X,-1,\xi) \end{pmatrix}\sigma_{app}(X,-1,\xi)](X,-1,D).$$

Note that the symbol $\sigma_{app}(X,-1,\xi)$ is a smooth symbol, we get by Prop. 3.2 and (2.2) that

$$|e_{d+1}\cdot \tilde{P}|_{\tilde{y}=-1}B(X,D)f|_{H^{k+\frac{1}{2}}} + |\tau_4(X,-1,D)f|_{H^{k+\frac{1}{2}}} \le M_k(m_0+2)|a|_{H^{k+\frac{5}{2}}}|f|_{L^2},$$

which leads to

$$|\partial_n^{\tilde{P}} f^b_{app}|_{\tilde{y}=-1}|_{H^{k+\frac{1}{2}}} \le M_k(m_0+2)|a|_{H^{k+\frac{5}{2}}}|f|_{L^2}. \tag{4.9}$$

Summing up (4.6),(4.8) and (4.9), we obtain

$$\|f^b_r\|_{k+2,2} \le M_k(2m_0+2)(|f|_{H^{k+\frac{1}{2}}} + |f|_{H^{m_0+1}}|a|_{H^{k+3}}). \tag{4.10}$$

The proof of Proposition 4.4 is finished. □

We next prove a tame commutator estimate which plays a key role in the energy estimate. It should be pointed out that we don't need this kind of estimates in the case of zero surface tension.

Theorem 4.6. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}, f \in H^{2k+\frac{1}{2}} \cap H^{m_0+2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then there holds

$$|[\sigma_a G(a,b)\sigma_a, \Lambda_a^k]f|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}} \le M_k(2m_0+2)(|f|_{H^{2k+\frac{1}{2}}} + |f|_{H^{m_0+2}}|a|_{H^{2k+4}}),$$

where $\sigma_a = (1+|\nabla_X a|^2)^{-\frac{1}{4}}$.

Remark 4.7. The above result seems surprising, since $[\sigma_a G(a,b)\sigma_a, \Lambda_a^k]$ should be an operator of order $2k$. However, thanks to special form of the operator Λ_a, the main part of $\sigma_a G(a,b)\sigma_a$ is the same as that of Λ_a so that it becomes an operator of order $2k-1$, which is a key point of this paper.

The proof of Theorem 4.6 is very technical and will be divided into two parts. In the first part, we deal with the commutator estimate between the main part of $G(a,b)$ and Λ_a which can be obtained by using pseudo-differential operators calculus. In the second part, we deal with the commutator estimate between the remainder of $G(a,b)$ and Λ_a which relies on the construction of the approximate solution of the variable coefficients elliptic equation on a flat strip.

Lemma 4.8. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}, f \in H^{k+\frac{3}{2}} \cap H^{m_0+2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then there holds

$$|[\sigma_a g_a(X,D)\sigma_a, \Lambda_a]f|_{H^{k+\frac{1}{2}}} \leq M_k(m_0+3)(|f|_{H^{k+\frac{3}{2}}} + |f|_{H^{m_0+2}}|a|_{H^{k+\frac{9}{2}}}).$$

Proof. We write

$$\begin{aligned}
&[\sigma_a g_a(X,D)\sigma_a, \Lambda_a] \\
&= \sigma_a g_a(X,D)[\sigma_a, \Lambda_a] + [\sigma_a g_a(X,D), \Lambda_a]\sigma_a \\
&= \sigma_a g_a(X,D) \circ ([\sigma_a, \Lambda_a] - \mathrm{Op}\{\sigma_a, \Lambda_a\}_1) + \sigma_a g_a(X,D) \circ \mathrm{Op}\{\sigma_a, \Lambda_a\}_1 \\
&\quad + ([\sigma_a g_a(X,D), \Lambda_a] - \mathrm{Op}\{\sigma_a g_a(X,\xi), \Lambda_a\}_1)\sigma_a + \mathrm{Op}\{\sigma_a g_a(X,\xi), \Lambda_a\}_1\sigma_a \\
&\triangleq \sigma_a g(X,D) \circ \tau_1(X,D) + \sigma_a g_a(X,D) \circ \mathrm{Op}\{\sigma_a, \Lambda_a\}_1 + \tau_2(X,D)\sigma_a \\
&\quad + \mathrm{Op}\{\sigma_a g_a(X,\xi), \Lambda_a\}_1\sigma_a.
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sigma_a g_a(X,D) \circ \mathrm{Op}\{\sigma_a, \Lambda_a\}_1 + \mathrm{Op}\{\sigma_a g_a(X,\xi), \Lambda_a\}_1\sigma_a \\
&= \big[\sigma_a g_a(X,D) \circ \mathrm{Op}\{\sigma_a, \Lambda_a\}_1 - \mathrm{Op}(\sigma_a g_a(X,\xi)\{\sigma_a, \Lambda_a\}_1)\big] \\
&\quad + \big[\mathrm{Op}\{\sigma_a g_a(X,\xi), \Lambda_a\}_1\sigma_a - \mathrm{Op}(\{\sigma_a g_a(X,\xi), \Lambda_a\}_1\sigma_a)\big] \\
&\quad + \mathrm{Op}(\sigma_a g_a(X,\xi)\{\sigma_a, \Lambda_a\}_1) + \mathrm{Op}(\{\sigma_a g_a(X,\xi), \Lambda_a\}_1\,\sigma_a) \\
&\triangleq \tau_3(X,D) + \tau_4(X,D) + \mathrm{Op}(\{\sigma_a g_a(X,\xi)\sigma_a, \Lambda_a\}_1).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\mathrm{Op}(\{\sigma_a g_a(X,\xi)\sigma_a, \Lambda_a\}_1) = 0.$$

Then we obtain

$$[\sigma_a g_a(X,D)\sigma_a, \Lambda_a] = \sigma_a g(X,D) \circ \tau_1(X,D) + \tau_2(X,D)\sigma_a + \tau_3(X,D) + \tau_4(X,D).$$

With this identity, the lemma can be deduced from Prop. 3.2-3.3. □

Lemma 4.9. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}, f \in H^{k+\frac{3}{2}} \cap H^{m_0+\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then there holds

$$\|[\tilde{\mathbf{P}} - \tilde{\mathbf{P}}_{app}, \Lambda_a]f^b_{app}\|_{k,2} \leq M_k(m_0+3)(|f|_{H^{k+\frac{3}{2}}} + |f|_{H^{m_0+\frac{3}{2}}}|a|_{H^{k+4}}).$$

Proof. Let τ_1, τ_2 be as in Prop. 4.4. We write

$$\begin{aligned}
[\tilde{\mathbf{P}} - \tilde{\mathbf{P}}_{app}, \Lambda_a]f^b_{app} &= [\tilde{\mathbf{P}} - \tilde{\mathbf{P}}_{app} + \tilde{p}_{d+1}\tau_2(X,\tilde{y},D) - \tilde{p}_{d+1}\tau_1(X,\tilde{y},D), \Lambda_a]f^b_{app} \\
&\quad + [\tilde{p}_{d+1}\tau_1(X,\tilde{y},D), \Lambda_a]f^b_{app} - [\tilde{p}_{d+1}\tau_2(X,\tilde{y},D), \Lambda_a]f^b_{app} \\
&\triangleq I_1 + I_2 + I_3.
\end{aligned}$$

From the proof of Prop. 4.4, we find that

$$I_1=[(\partial_{\tilde y}\tilde p_{d+1}+\nabla_X\cdot\tilde{\mathbf p})\partial_{\tilde y}-(\nabla_X\cdot\tilde P_1+\partial_{\tilde y}\tilde{\mathbf p})\cdot\nabla_X,\Lambda_a]f^b_{app}.$$

So we get by Prop. 3.3 and (2.2) that

$$\|I_1\|_{k,2}\le M_k(m_0+3)(|f|_{H^{k+\frac32}}+|f|_{H^{m_0+\frac32}}|a|_{H^{k+4}}),$$

where we used the fact that(see also (4.6))

$$\|f^b_{app}\|_{k+2,2}\le M_k(m_0+1)(|f|_{H^{k+\frac32}}+|f|_{H^{m_0+\frac12}}|a|_{H^{k+3}}).$$

Similarly, we have

$$\|I_2\|_{k,2}+\|I_3\|_{k,2}\le M_k(m_0+2)(|f|_{H^{k+\frac32}}+|f|_{H^{m_0+\frac32}}|a|_{H^{k+3}}).$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 4.9. □

Lemma 4.10. Let $k\in\mathbb N, f\in H^{k+\frac32}\cap H^{m_0+2}(\mathbb R^d)$. Then there holds

$$|[R_a,\Lambda_a]f|_{H^{k+\frac12}}\le M_k(2m_0+2)(|f|_{H^{k+\frac32}}+|f|_{H^{m_0+2}}|a|_{H^{k+5}}).$$

Proof. Note that

$$R_af=-\partial_n^{\tilde P}(f^b-f^b_{app})|_{\tilde y=0}\triangleq-\partial_n^{\tilde P}f^b_r|_{\tilde y=0},$$

so we have

$$[R_a,\Lambda_a]f=e_{d+1}\cdot\tilde P\nabla_{X,\tilde y}((\Lambda_af)^b_r-\Lambda_af^b_r)|_{\tilde y=0}+e_{d+1}\cdot[\tilde P\nabla_{X,\tilde y},\Lambda_a]f^b_r|_{\tilde y=0}.$$

Firstly, we get by Prop. 3.3, (2.2) and (4.10) that

$$|[\tilde P\nabla_{X,\tilde y},\Lambda_a]f^b_r|_{\tilde y=0}|_{H^{k+\frac12}}\le M_k(2m_0+2)(|f|_{H^{k+\frac32}}+|f|_{H^{m_0+1}}|a|_{H^{k+4}}).\tag{4.11}$$

We now estimate the term $|e_{d+1}\cdot\tilde P\nabla_{X,\tilde y}((\Lambda_af)^b_r-\Lambda_af^b_r)|_{\tilde y=0}|_{H^{k+\frac12}}$. By the trace theorem, it suffices to estimate $\|(\Lambda_af)^b_r-\Lambda_af^b_r\|_{k+2,2}$. By the definition,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mathbf P}f^b_r&=-(\tilde{\mathbf P}-\tilde{\mathbf P}_{app})f^b_{app}-\tilde{\mathbf P}_{app}f^b_{app},\\ \tilde{\mathbf P}(\Lambda_af)^b_r&=-(\tilde{\mathbf P}-\tilde{\mathbf P}_{app})(\Lambda_af)^b_{app}-\tilde{\mathbf P}_{app}(\Lambda_af)^b_{app},\end{aligned}$$

which lead to

$$\begin{aligned}&\tilde{\mathbf P}((\Lambda_af)^b_r-\Lambda_af^b_r)\\&=-[\tilde{\mathbf P}-\tilde{\mathbf P}_{app},\Lambda_a]f^b_{app}+(\tilde{\mathbf P}-\tilde{\mathbf P}_{app})(\Lambda_af^b_{app}-(\Lambda_af)^b_{app})-[\tilde{\mathbf P},\Lambda_a]f^b_r\\&\quad-\tilde{\mathbf P}_{app}(\Lambda_af)^b_{app}+\Lambda_a\tilde{\mathbf P}_{app}f^b_{app}\triangleq h,\end{aligned}$$

together with the following boundary conditions

$$\begin{aligned}&(\Lambda_af)^b_r-\Lambda_af^b_r|_{\tilde y=0}=0,\quad\text{and}\\&-\partial_n^{\tilde P}((\Lambda_af)^b_r-\Lambda_af^b_r)|_{\tilde y=-1}\\&=\big(e_{d+1}\cdot\tilde P\nabla_{X,\tilde y}(\Lambda_af)^b_{app}-e_{d+1}\cdot\Lambda_a\tilde P\nabla_{X,\tilde y}f^b_{app}+e_{d+1}\cdot[\tilde P\nabla_{X,\tilde y},\Lambda_a]f^b_r\big)|_{\tilde y=-1}.\end{aligned}$$

We get by Prop. 2.2 that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|(\Lambda_a f)^b_r - \Lambda_a f^b_r\|_{k+2,2}\\
&\le M_k(2m_0+2)\big(\|h\|_{k,2} + |\partial_n^{\tilde{P}}((\Lambda_a f)^b_r - \Lambda_a f^b_r)|_{\tilde{y}=-1}|_{H^{k+\frac{1}{2}}}\big)\\
&\quad + M_k(2m_0+2)\big(\|h\|_{m_0-1,2} + |\partial_n^{\tilde{P}}((\Lambda_a f)^b_r - \Lambda_a f^b_r)|_{\tilde{y}=-1}|_{H^{m_0-\frac{1}{2}}}\big)|a|_{H^{k+2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Following the proof of Step 3 in Prop. 4.4 and (4.11), we find that

$$|\partial_n^{\tilde{P}}((\Lambda_a f)^b_r - \Lambda_a f^b_r)|_{\tilde{y}=-1}|_{H^{k+\frac{1}{2}}} \le M_k(2m_0+2)(|f|_{H^{k+\frac{3}{2}}} + |f|_{H^{m_0+1}}|a|_{H^{k+4}}).$$

By the definition of h, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|h\|_{k,2} &\le \|[\tilde{\mathbf{P}} - \tilde{\mathbf{P}}_{app}, \Lambda_a]f^b_{app}\|_{k,2} + \|(\tilde{\mathbf{P}} - \tilde{\mathbf{P}}_{app})(\Lambda_a f^b_{app} - (\Lambda_a f)^b_{app})\|_{k,2}\\
&\quad + \|[\tilde{\mathbf{P}}, \Lambda_a]f^b_r\|_{k,2} + \|\Lambda_a \tilde{\mathbf{P}}_{app} f^b_{app} - \tilde{\mathbf{P}}_{app}(\Lambda_a f)^b_{app}\|_{k,2}\\
&\triangleq I + II + III + IV.
\end{aligned}$$

We get by Lemma 4.9 that

$$I \le M_k(m_0+3)(|f|_{H^{k+\frac{3}{2}}} + |f|_{H^{m_0+\frac{3}{2}}}|a|_{H^{k+4}}). \tag{4.12}$$

and by the proof of Proposition 4.4,

$$III \le M_k(2m_0+2)(|f|_{H^{k+\frac{3}{2}}} + |f|_{H^{m_0+1}}|a|_{H^{k+3}}). \tag{4.13}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
II &\le M_k(m_0+2)\big(\|\Lambda_a f^b_{app} - (\Lambda_a f)^b_{app}\|_{k+1,2}\\
&\quad + \|\Lambda_2 f^b_{app} - (\Lambda_a f)^b_{app}\|_{m_0+1,2}|a|_{H^{k+2}}\big).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\Lambda_a f^b_{app} - (\Lambda_a f)^b_{app}]\|_{k+1,2}\\
&\le \|[\Lambda_a, \tilde{\sigma}_{app}]\exp(\frac{C_+}{2}\tilde{y}|D|)f\|_{k+1,2} + \|\tilde{\sigma}_{app}[\Lambda_a, \exp(\frac{C_+}{2}\tilde{y}|D|)]f\|_{k+1,2}.
\end{aligned}$$

By Prop. 3.3, (2.2) and (4.7), the first term above is bounded by

$$M_k(m_0+2)(|f|_{H^{k+\frac{3}{2}}} + |f|_{H^{m_0+\frac{3}{2}}}|a|_{H^{k+4}}).$$

By the definition of $\widetilde{\sigma}_{app}$ in Prop 4.4, we rewrite it as

$$\widetilde{\sigma}_{app}(X, \widetilde{y}, D) = \sigma_{app}(X, \widetilde{y}, D)\exp(-\frac{3C_+}{4}\tilde{y}|D|)\exp(\frac{C_+}{4}\tilde{y}|D|).$$

Note that $\sigma_{app}(X, \widetilde{y}, D)\exp(-\frac{3C_+}{4}\tilde{y}|D|)$ is still a pseudo-differential operator of order 0, we thus get by Prop. 3.2, (2.2) and (4.7) that

$$\|\widetilde{\sigma}_{app}u(\cdot, \widetilde{y})\|_{k+1} \le M_k(m_0+1)\sup_{\widetilde{y}\in[-1,0]}(|u(\cdot, \widetilde{y})|_{H^{k+\frac{1}{2}}} + |u(\cdot, \widetilde{y})|_{H^{m_0}}|a|_{H^{k+2}}) \tag{4.14}$$

On the other hand, we can show by using Bony's paraproduct decomposition[7] that for any $\widetilde{y} \in [-1, 0]$

$$|[\Lambda_a, \exp(\frac{C_+}{2}\tilde{y}|D|)]f|_{H^{k+\frac{1}{2}}} \le M_k(m_0+2)(|f|_{H^{k+\frac{3}{2}}} + |f|_{H^{m_0+2}}|a|_{H^{k+4}}),$$

which together with (4.14) gives

$$\|\tilde{\sigma}_{app}[\Lambda_a, \exp(\frac{C_+}{2}\tilde{y}|D|)]f\|_{k+1,2} \le M_k(m_0+2)(|f|_{H^{k+\frac{3}{2}}} + |f|_{H^{m_0+2}}|a|_{H^{k+4}}). \tag{4.15}$$

So, we get

$$II \le M_k(m_0+2)(|f|_{H^{k+\frac{3}{2}}} + |f|_{H^{m_0+2}}|a|_{H^{k+4}}). \tag{4.16}$$

For IV, we have

$$IV = \|[\Lambda_a, \tilde{\mathbf{P}}_{app} \circ \sigma_{app}]f\|_{k,2},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mathbf{P}} \circ \sigma_{app} &= -\tilde{p}_{d+1}(\partial_{\tilde{y}} - \eta_-(X,\tilde{y},D))\tau(X,\tilde{y},D)\exp(\frac{C_+}{2}\tilde{y}|D|),\\ \tau(X,\tilde{y},D) &= (\eta_+\tilde{\sigma}_{app})(X,\tilde{y},D) - \eta_+ \circ \tilde{\sigma}_{app}(X,\tilde{y},D).\end{aligned}$$

So, we get

$$\begin{aligned}[\Lambda_a, \tilde{\mathbf{P}}_{app} \circ \sigma_{app}] &= \tilde{p}_{d+1}(\partial_{\tilde{y}} - \eta_-)[\tau, \Lambda_a]\exp(\frac{C_+}{2}\tilde{y}|D|)\\ &+[\tilde{p}_{d+1}(\partial_{\tilde{y}} - \eta_-), \Lambda_a]\tau\exp(\frac{C_+}{2}\tilde{y}|D|) + \tilde{p}_{d+1}(\partial_{\tilde{y}} - \eta_-)\tau[\exp(\frac{C_+}{2}\tilde{y}|D|), \Lambda_a],\end{aligned}$$

from which, we get by Prop. 3.2-3.3, (2.2) and (4.7) (for the last term, we need to use a similar argument leading to (4.15)) that

$$IV \le M_k(m_0+3)(|f|_{H^{k+\frac{3}{2}}} + |f|_{H^{m_0+2}}|a|_{H^{k+5}}). \tag{4.17}$$

Summing up (4.12-4.13) and (4.16-4.17), we obtain

$$\|h\|_{k,2} \le M_k(2m_0+2)(|f|_{H^{k+\frac{3}{2}}} + |f|_{H^{m_0+2}}|a|_{H^{k+5}}).$$

Thus, we have

$$\|(\Lambda_a f)_r^b - \Lambda_a f_r^b\|_{k+2,2} \le M_k(2m_0+2)(|f|_{H^{k+\frac{3}{2}}} + |f|_{H^{m_0+2}}|a|_{H^{k+5}}),$$

from which and (4.11), we conclude the lemma. □

Now we are in a position to prove Theorem 4.6.

Proof of Theorem 4.6. By the definition of $G(a,b)$,

$$\begin{aligned}[\sigma_a G(a,b)\sigma_a, \Lambda_a^k]f &= \sum_{i=0}^{k-1}\Lambda_a^i[\sigma_a g_a(X,D)\sigma_a, \Lambda_a]\Lambda_a^{k-i-1}f\\ &+\sum_{i=0}^{k-1}\Lambda_a^i[\sigma_a R_a\sigma_a, \Lambda_a]\Lambda_a^{k-i-1}f \triangleq I + II.\end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 3.5 and Lemma 4.8, we get by the interpolation argument that

$$|I|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}} \le M_k(m_0+3)(|f|_{H^{2k+\frac{1}{2}}} + |f|_{H^{m_0+2}}|a|_{H^{2k+\frac{7}{2}}}).$$

And by Lemma 3.5, Prop. 4.4, Prop. 3.3 and Lemma 4.10, we have

$$|II|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}} \le M_k(2m_0+2)(|f|_{H^{2k+\frac{1}{2}}} + |f|_{H^{m_0+2}}|a|_{H^{2k+4}}).$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 4.6. □

5. The linearized water wave equations

5.1. The linearized system. We rewrite the water wave equations (1.11) as

$$\partial_t U + \mathcal{F}(U) = 0, \tag{5.1}$$

where $U = (\zeta, \psi)^T$ and $\mathcal{F}(U) = (\mathcal{F}_1(U), \mathcal{F}_2(U)^T$ with

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_1(U) =& - G(\zeta)\psi,\\ \mathcal{F}_2(U) =& g\zeta + \frac{1}{2}|\nabla_X\psi|^2 - \frac{(G(\zeta)\psi + \nabla_X\zeta\cdot\nabla_X\psi)^2}{2(1+|\nabla_X\zeta|^2)}\\ &- \kappa\nabla_X\cdot\big(\frac{\nabla_X\zeta}{\sqrt{1+|\nabla_X\zeta|^2}}\big).\end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

We will linearize the system (5.1) around an admissible reference state in the following sense:

Definition 5.1. Let $T > 0$. We say that $\underline{U} = (\underline{\zeta}, \underline{\psi})^T$ is an admissible reference state if $(\underline{\zeta}, \underline{\psi} - \underline{\psi}|_{t=0})^T \in C([0,T]; H^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)^2)$ and $\nabla_X\underline{\psi}|_{t=0} \in H^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)^d$, and if moreover

$$\exists h_0 > 0 \qquad \text{such that} \quad \min\{-b, \underline{\zeta} - b\} \geq h_0 \qquad \text{on} \quad [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d,$$

where $y = b(X)$ is a parameterization of the bottom.

The linearized operator $\underline{\mathcal{L}}$ associated to (5.1) is given by

$$\underline{\mathcal{L}} := \partial_t + d_{\underline{U}}\mathcal{F},$$

where

$$d_{\underline{U}}\mathcal{F} = \begin{pmatrix} -d_{\underline{\zeta}}G(\cdot)\underline{\psi} & -G(\underline{\zeta}) \\ g - \underline{Z}d_{\underline{\zeta}}G(\cdot)\underline{\psi} - \underline{Z}\underline{v}\cdot\nabla_X - \underline{A} & -\underline{Z}G(\underline{\zeta}) + \underline{v}\cdot\nabla_X \end{pmatrix},$$

with $\underline{Z} = Z(\underline{U})$, $\underline{A} = A(\underline{U})$ and $\underline{v} = v(\underline{U})$, and for all $U = (\zeta, \psi)^T$ smooth enough

$$\begin{aligned} Z(U) &:= \frac{1}{1+|\nabla_X\zeta|^2}(G(\zeta)\psi + \nabla_X\zeta\cdot\nabla_X\psi),\\ A(U) &:= \kappa\nabla_X\cdot\Big[\frac{\nabla_X}{\sqrt{1+|\nabla_X\zeta|^2}} - \frac{\nabla_X\zeta(\nabla_X\zeta\cdot\nabla_X)}{(1+|\nabla_X\zeta|^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}}\Big],\\ v(U) &:= \nabla_X\psi - Z(U)\nabla_X\zeta. \end{aligned}$$

According to Theorem 3.20 in [13], we have

$$d_{\underline{\zeta}}G(\cdot)\underline{\psi}\cdot\zeta = -G(\underline{\zeta})(\underline{Z}\zeta) - \nabla_X\cdot(\zeta\underline{v}),$$

so that $\underline{\mathcal{L}}$ becomes

$$\underline{\mathcal{L}} = \partial_t + \begin{pmatrix} G(\underline{\zeta})(\underline{Z}\cdot) + \nabla_X\cdot(\cdot\underline{v}) & -G(\underline{\zeta}) \\ \underline{Z}G(\underline{\zeta})(\underline{Z}\cdot) + (g + \underline{Z}\nabla_X\cdot\underline{v}) - \underline{A} & -\underline{Z}G(\underline{\zeta}) + \underline{v}\cdot\nabla_X \end{pmatrix}.$$

Taking $V = (\zeta, \psi - \underline{Z}\zeta)^T$ as a new unknown, the linearized equation $\underline{\mathcal{L}}U = G$ is equivalent to

$$\underline{\mathcal{M}}V = H \quad \text{on} \quad [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{5.3}$$

where

$$H := \begin{pmatrix} G_1 \\ G_2 - \underline{Z}G_1 \end{pmatrix} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \underline{\mathcal{M}} := \partial_t + \begin{pmatrix} \nabla_X \cdot (\cdot \underline{v}) & -G(\underline{\zeta}) \\ \underline{a} - \underline{A} & \underline{v} \cdot \nabla_X \end{pmatrix}$$

with $\underline{a} := g + \partial_t \underline{Z} + \underline{v} \cdot \nabla_X \underline{Z}$.

5.2. **Well-posedness of the linearized system.** We consider the linearized system

$$\begin{cases} \underline{\mathcal{M}}V = H \\ V|_{t=0} = V_0 \end{cases}, \quad \text{with} \quad \underline{\mathcal{M}} = \partial_t + \begin{pmatrix} \nabla_X \cdot (\cdot \underline{v}) & -G(\underline{\zeta}) \\ \underline{a} - \underline{A} & \underline{v} \cdot \nabla_X \end{pmatrix}. \tag{5.4}$$

We obtain the following well-posedness and tame energy estimates of (5.4).

Proposition 5.2. Let $T > 0$ and $\underline{U}$ be an admissible reference state. Assume that $H \in C([0,T] \times H^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)^2)$ and $V_0 \in H^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)^2$. Then there is a unique solution $V \in C^1([0,T], H^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)^2)$ to (5.4) and for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a constant C_k such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&|V(t)|_{H^{2k+1}\times H^{2k+\frac{1}{2}}} \\
&\le C_k e^{C_k t}\big[|V_0|_{H^{2k+1}\times H^{2k+\frac{1}{2}}} + |V_0|_{H^{2m_0+1}\times H^{2m_0+\frac{1}{2}}}(1 + |\underline{\zeta}|_{H^{2k+2}})\big] \\
&+C_k \int_0^t e^{C_k(t-\tau)}\big[|H|_{H^{2k+1}\times H^{2k+\frac{1}{2}}} + |H|_{H^{2m_0+1}\times H^{2m_0+\frac{1}{2}}}(1 + |\underline{\zeta}|_{H^{2k+2}})\big]d\tau \\
&+C_k |V_0|_{H^{2m_0+1}\times H^{2m_0+\frac{1}{2}}} \\
&\quad \times \int_0^t e^{C_k(t-\tau)}\big(1 + |\underline{\zeta}|_{H^{2k+4}} + |\underline{v}|_{H^{2k+2}} + |\underline{a} - g|_{H^{2k+\frac{1}{2}}} + |\partial_t \underline{\zeta}|_{H^{2k+2}}\big)d\tau,
\end{aligned}$$

where $C_k = C(k, \kappa, B, |\underline{\zeta}|_{H^{q_0}}, |\underline{v}|_{H_T^{q_0}}, |\underline{a} - g|_{H_T^{q_0}}, |\partial_t \underline{\zeta}|_{H^{q_0}})$, and q_0 is a constant depending only on d. Moreover, if $\underline{\mathcal{M}}$ satisfies the Lévy condition

$$\exists\, c_0 > 0 \quad \text{such that} \quad \underline{a}(t,X) \ge c_0, \quad \forall (t,X) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{5.5}$$

there exists a constant $\widetilde{C}_k$ independent of κ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\sqrt{\kappa} V_1(t)|_{H^{2k+1}} + |V(t)|_{H^{2k}\times H^{2k+\frac{1}{2}}} \le C_k e^{C_k t}\big[|\sqrt{\kappa} V_{01}|_{H^{2k+1}} \\
&\quad +|V_0|_{H^{2k}\times H^{2k+\frac{1}{2}}} + |V_0|_{H^{2m_0}\times H^{2m_0+\frac{1}{2}}}(1 + |\underline{\zeta}|_{H^{2k+2}})\big] \\
&+C_k \int_0^t e^{C_k(t-\tau)}\big[|H|_{H^{2k+1}\times H^{2k+\frac{1}{2}}} + |H|_{H^{2m_0}\times H^{2m_0+\frac{1}{2}}}(1 + |\underline{\zeta}|_{H^{2k+2}})\big]d\tau \\
&+C_k |V_0|_{H^{2m_0}\times H^{2m_0+\frac{1}{2}}} \\
&\quad \times \int_0^t e^{C_k(t-\tau)}\big(1 + |\underline{\zeta}|_{H^{2k+4}} + |\underline{v}|_{H^{2k+2}} + |\underline{a} - g|_{H^{2k+\frac{1}{2}}} + |\partial_t \underline{\zeta}|_{H^{2k+2}}\big)d\tau,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\widetilde{C}_k = C(k, c_0, B, |\underline{\zeta}|_{H^{q_0}}, |\underline{v}|_{H_T^{q_0}}, |\underline{a} - g|_{H_T^{q_0}}, |\partial_t \underline{\zeta}|_{H^{q_0}})$.

Proof. As the existence of solutions to (5.4) follows from the *a priori* estimates for the approximate solutions(which can be constructed by a parabolic regularization as in [13]), here we only present the *a priori* tame estimate to smooth enough solutions of (5.4).

We rewrite the linear system (5.4) as

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t V_1 + \nabla_X \cdot (\underline{v} V_1) - \underline{G} V_2 = H_1 \\ \partial_t V_2 + (\underline{a} - \underline{A}) V_1 + \underline{v} \cdot \nabla_X V_2 = H_2 \\ V|_{t=0} = V_0 \end{cases} \tag{5.6}$$

where we write $\underline{G}$ for $G(\underline{\zeta})$. We introduce the following energy functional $E_k(V)$ defined by

$$E_k(V) := (\widetilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma V_1, \sigma^{-1}(\underline{a} - \underline{A})\, \sigma^{-1} \widetilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma V_1) + (\widetilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma^{-1} V_2, \sigma \underline{G}\, \sigma \widetilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma^{-1} V_2),$$

where

$$\widetilde{\Lambda} = |D|^2 - \frac{\partial_i \underline{\zeta} \partial_j \underline{\zeta}}{1 + |\nabla_X \underline{\zeta}|^2} D_i D_j, \quad \sigma = (1 + |\nabla_X \underline{\zeta}|^2)^{-\frac{1}{4}}.$$

Fix a constant $\lambda > 0$ to be determined later. We have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt} e^{-2\lambda t} E_k(V) \\ &= e^{-2\lambda t} \big[-2\lambda E_k(V) + 2(\tilde{\Lambda}^k\, \partial_t(\,\sigma V_1), \sigma^{-1}(\underline{a} - \underline{A}) \sigma^{-1} \tilde{\Lambda}^k\, \sigma V_1) \\ &\quad + 2(\tilde{\Lambda}^k \partial_t(\sigma^{-1} V_2), \sigma \underline{G} \sigma \tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma^{-1} V_2) + (\tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma V_1, [\partial_t,\, \sigma^{-1}(\underline{a} - \underline{A}) \sigma^{-1}] \tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma V_1) \\ &\quad + (\tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma^{-1} V_2, [\partial_t,\, \sigma \underline{G} \sigma] \tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma^{-1} V_2) + 2([\partial_t,\, \tilde{\Lambda}^k] \sigma V_1, \sigma^{-1}(\underline{a} - \underline{A}) \sigma^{-1} \tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma V_1) \\ &\quad + 2([\partial_t, \tilde{\Lambda}^k]\, \sigma^{-1} V_2, \sigma \underline{G}\, \sigma \tilde{\Lambda}^k\, \sigma^{-1} V_2) \big] \\ &\triangleq e^{-2\lambda t}(I_1 + \cdots + I_7). \end{aligned}$$

Let us begin with the estimates of $I_1 - I_7$.

Estimtates of $I_2 + I_3$.

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &= 2(\tilde{\Lambda}^k (\partial_t\, \sigma) V_1, \sigma^{-1}(\underline{a} - \underline{A}) \sigma^{-1} \tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma V_1) \\ &\quad + 2(\tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma \partial_t V_1, \sigma^{-1}(\underline{a} - \underline{A}) \sigma^{-1} \tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma V_1) \\ &\triangleq I_{21} + I_{22}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.5, we have

$$|I_{21}| \le C_k [|V_1|^2_{H^{2k}} + \kappa |V_1|^2_{H^{2k+1}} + |V_1|^2_{H^{m_0}} (|\underline{\zeta}|^2_{H^{2k+2}} + |\partial_t \underline{\zeta}|^2_{H^{2k+2}})]. \tag{5.7}$$

Using the first equation of (5.6), we rewrite I_{22} as

$$\begin{aligned} I_{22} &= 2(\tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma \underline{G} V_2, \sigma^{-1}(\underline{a} - \underline{A}) \sigma^{-1} \tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma V_1) \\ &\quad - 2(\tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma \nabla_{\underline{v}} V_1, \sigma^{-1}(\underline{a} - \underline{A}) \sigma^{-1} \tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma V_1) \\ &\quad - 2(\tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma \frac{1}{2} (\nabla_X \cdot \underline{v}) V_1, \sigma^{-1}(\underline{a} - \underline{A}) \sigma^{-1} \tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma V_1) \\ &\quad + 2(\tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma H_1, \sigma^{-1}(\underline{a} - \underline{A})\, \sigma^{-1} \tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma V_1) \\ &\triangleq I^1_{22} + \cdots + I^4_{22}. \end{aligned}$$

Here the operator $\nabla_{\underline{v}}$ is defined by

$$\nabla_{\underline{v}} f \triangleq \frac{1}{2}(\nabla_X \cdot (f\,\underline{v}) + \underline{v} \cdot \nabla_X f).$$

Since $\nabla_{\underline{v}}$ is an anti-adjoint operator, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_{22}^2 &= 2([\tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma, \nabla_{\underline{v}}]V_1, \sigma^{-1}(\underline{a} - \underline{A})\sigma^{-1}\tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma V_1) \\ &\quad -(\tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma V_1, [\sigma^{-1}(\underline{a} - \underline{A})\sigma^{-1}, \nabla_{\underline{v}}]\tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma V_1), \end{aligned}$$

which together with Lemma 3.5 gives

$$|I_{22}^2| \le C_k\big[|V_1|_{H^{2k}}^2 + \kappa |V_1|_{H^{2k+1}}^2 + |V_1|_{H^{m_0}}^2(|\underline{\zeta}|_{H^{2k+3}}^2 + |\underline{v}|_{H^{2k+2}}^2)\big]. \tag{5.8}$$

Again, we get by Lemma 3.5 that

$$|I_{22}^3| \le C_k\big[|V_1|_{H^{2k}}^2 + \kappa |V_1|_{H^{2k+1}}^2 + |V_1|_{H^{m_0}}^2(|\underline{\zeta}|_{H^{2k+2}}^2 + |\underline{v}|_{H^{2k+2}}^2)\big], \tag{5.9}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |I_{22}^4| &\le C_k\big[|H_1|_{H^{2k+1}}^2 + |V_1|_{H^{2k}}^2 + \kappa |V_1|_{H^{2k+1}}^2 \\ &\quad + (|H_1|_{H^{m_0}}^2 + |V_1|_{H^{m_0}}^2)|\underline{\zeta}|_{H^{2k+2}}^2\big]. \end{aligned} \tag{5.10}$$

The term I_{22}^1 will be handled together with I_3. We have

$$\begin{aligned} I_3 &= 2(\tilde{\Lambda}^k(\partial_t \sigma^{-1})V_2, \sigma \underline{G} \sigma \tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma^{-1} V_2) + 2(\tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma^{-1}\partial_t V_2, \sigma \underline{G} \sigma \tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma^{-1} V_2) \\ &\triangleq I_{31} + I_{32}. \end{aligned}$$

We get by Prop. 4.3 and Lemma 3.5 that

$$\begin{aligned} |I_{31}| &\le C_k(|\sigma \tilde{\Lambda}^k \partial_t(\sigma^{-1})V_2|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + |\sigma \tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma^{-1} V_2|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2) \\ &\le C_k\big[|V_2|_{H^{2k+\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + |V_2|_{H^{m_0}}^2(|\underline{\zeta}|_{H^{2k+\frac{3}{2}}}^2 + |\partial_t \underline{\zeta}|_{H^{2k+\frac{3}{2}}}^2)\big]. \end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

From the second equation of (5.6), we get

$$\begin{aligned} I_{32} &= -2(\tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma^{-1}(\underline{a} - \underline{A})V_1, \sigma \underline{G} \sigma \tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma^{-1} V_2) \\ &\quad -2(\tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma^{-1} \nabla_{\underline{v}} V_2, \sigma \underline{G} \sigma \tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma^{-1} V_2) \\ &\quad +2(\tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma^{-1} \frac{1}{2}(\nabla_X \cdot \underline{v})V_2, \sigma \underline{G} \sigma \tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma^{-1} V_2) \\ &\quad +2(\tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma^{-1} H_2, \sigma \underline{G} \sigma \tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma^{-1} V_2) \\ &\triangleq I_{32}^1 + \cdots + I_{32}^4. \end{aligned}$$

Again, by the fact that $\nabla_{\underline{v}}$ is anti-adjoint, we have

$$I_{32}^2 = -2([\tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma^{-1}, \nabla_{\underline{v}}]V_2, \sigma \underline{G} \sigma \tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma^{-1} V_2) + (\tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma^{-1} V_2, [\sigma \underline{G} \sigma, \nabla_{\underline{v}}]\tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma^{-1} V_2).$$

The first term above can be handled as in I_{31}, and for the second one we need to use Prop. 3.18 in [13]. Then we get by Lemma 3.5 that

$$|I_{32}^2| \le C_k\big[|V_2|_{H^{2k+\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + |V_2|_{H^{m_0}}^2(|\underline{\zeta}|_{H^{2k+\frac{5}{2}}}^2 + |\underline{v}|_{H^{2k+\frac{3}{2}}}^2)\big]. \tag{5.12}$$

Similarly, we have

$$|I_{32}^3| \le C_k\big[|V_2|_{H^{2k+\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + |V_2|_{H^{m_0}}^2(|\underline{\zeta}|_{H^{2k+\frac{3}{2}}}^2 + |\underline{v}|_{H^{2k+\frac{3}{2}}}^2)\big], \tag{5.13}$$

$$|I_{32}^4| \le C_k\big[|H_2|_{H^{2k+\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + |V_2|_{H^{2k+\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + (|H_2|_{H^{m_0}}^2 + |V|_{H^{m_0}}^2)|\underline{\zeta}|_{H^{2k+\frac{3}{2}}}^2\big]. \tag{5.14}$$

Now it remains to estimate $I_{22}^1 + I_{32}^1$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} I_{22}^1 + I_{32}^1 &= 2(\tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma \underline{G} V_2, \sigma^{-1}(\underline{a} - \underline{A})\sigma^{-1}\tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma V_1) \\ &\quad -2(\tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma^{-1}(\underline{a} - \underline{A})V_1, \sigma \underline{G} \sigma \tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma^{-1} V_2) \\ &\triangleq 2(II + III). \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of $\underline{A}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{A} &= \kappa \nabla_X \cdot \Big[\frac{\nabla_X}{\sqrt{1+|\nabla_X \underline{\zeta}|^2}} - \frac{\nabla_X \underline{\zeta}(\nabla_X \underline{\zeta} \cdot \nabla_X)}{(1+|\nabla_X \underline{\zeta}|^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}}\Big] \\ &= \kappa \nabla_X \cdot [\sigma^2 \nabla_X - \sigma^6 \nabla_X \underline{\zeta}(\nabla_X \underline{\zeta} \cdot \nabla_X)], \end{aligned}$$

so we get

$$\begin{aligned} II &= (\tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma \underline{G} V_2, \underline{a}\sigma^{-2}\tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma V_1) \\ &\quad -\kappa(\tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma \underline{G} V_2, \sigma^{-1}\nabla_X \cdot \ \sigma^2 \nabla_X \sigma^{-1}\tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma V_1) \\ &\quad +\kappa(\tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma \underline{G} V_2, \sigma^{-1}\nabla_X \cdot \sigma^6 \nabla_X \underline{\zeta}(\nabla_X \underline{\zeta} \cdot \nabla_X \sigma^{-1}\tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma V_1)) \\ &\triangleq II_1 + II_2 + II_3. \end{aligned}$$

We rewrite II_1 as

$$\begin{aligned} II_1 &= (\sigma \underline{G} \sigma \tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma^{-1} V_2, \tilde{\Lambda}^k \underline{a} \sigma^{-1} V_1) + ([\tilde{\Lambda}^k, \sigma \underline{G} \sigma]\sigma^{-1} V_2, \underline{a}\sigma^{-2}\tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma V_1) \\ &\quad +(\sigma \underline{G} \sigma \tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma^{-1} V_2, [\underline{a}\sigma^{-2}, \tilde{\Lambda}^k]\sigma V_1) \\ &\triangleq II_{11} + II_{12} + II_{13}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.5, Prop. 4.2 and Thm. 4.6, we have

$$|\mathcal{R}_1| \triangleq |II_{12} + II_{13}| \leq C_k \big[|V_1|_{H^{2k}}^2 + |V_2|_{H^{2k+\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + |V|_{H^{m_0+2}}^2 |\underline{\zeta}|_{H^{2k+4}}^2\big]. \tag{5.15}$$

Now, we decompose II_2 as

$$\begin{aligned} II_2 &= -\kappa(\tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma \underline{G} V_2, \sigma^{-1}\nabla_X \cdot \sigma[\sigma \nabla_X \sigma^{-1}, \ \tilde{\Lambda}^k]\sigma V_1) \\ &\quad -\kappa(\tilde{\Lambda}^k \ \sigma \underline{G} V_2, \sigma^{-1}\nabla_X \cdot \ \sigma \tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma \nabla_X V_1) \\ &= -\kappa(\tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma \underline{G} V_2, \sigma^{-1}(\nabla_X \sigma) \cdot [\sigma \nabla_X \sigma^{-1}, \tilde{\Lambda}^k]\sigma V_1) \\ &\quad -\kappa(\tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma \underline{G} V_2, \sigma^{-1}\sigma \nabla_X \cdot [\sigma \nabla_X \sigma^{-1}, \tilde{\Lambda}^k]\sigma V_1) \\ &\quad -\kappa(\tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma \underline{G} V_2, \sigma^{-1}(\nabla_X \sigma) \cdot \tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma \nabla_X V_1) \\ &\quad -\kappa(\tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma \underline{G} V_2, \sigma^{-1}\sigma \nabla_X \cdot \tilde{\Lambda}^k \sigma \nabla_X V_1) \\ &\triangleq II_{21} + II_{22} + II_{23} + II_{24}. \end{aligned}$$

We get by Lemma 3.5 and Prop. 4.2 that

$$|II_{21}| \leq C_k \big[\kappa |V_1|_{H^{2k+1}}^2 + |V_2|_{H^{2k+\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + |V|_{H^{m_0}}^2 |\underline{\zeta}|_{H^{2k+3}}^2\big]. \tag{5.16}$$

We write II_{22} as

$$\begin{aligned}
II_{22} &= -\kappa(\tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma\underline{G}V_2, \nabla_X\cdot[\sigma\nabla_X\,\sigma^{-1},\tilde{\Lambda}^k]\sigma V_1)\\
&= -\kappa(\tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma\underline{G}V_2, \sigma\nabla_X\cdot\sigma^{-1}[\sigma\nabla_X\,\sigma^{-1},\tilde{\Lambda}^k]\sigma V_1)\\
&\quad +\kappa(\tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma\underline{G}V_2, \sigma(\nabla_X\sigma^{-1})\cdot[\sigma\nabla_X\,\sigma^{-1},\tilde{\Lambda}^k]\sigma V_1)\\
&\triangleq II_{22}^1 + II_{22}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

As in (5.16), we have

$$|II_{22}^2| \le C_k\big[\kappa|V_1|^2_{H^{2k+1}} + |V_2|^2_{H^{2k+\frac{1}{2}}} + |V|^2_{H^{m_0}}|\underline{\zeta}|^2_{H^{2k+3}}\big]. \tag{5.17}$$

We write II_{23} as

$$\begin{aligned}
II_{23} &= -\kappa(\tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma\underline{G}V_2, [\sigma^{-1}(\nabla_X\,\sigma),\tilde{\Lambda}^k]\cdot\sigma\nabla_X V_1)\\
&\quad -\kappa(\tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma\underline{G}V_2, \tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma^{-1}(\nabla_X\,\sigma)\cdot\sigma\nabla_X V_1)\\
&\triangleq II_{23}^1 + II_{23}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

As in (5.16), we have

$$|II_{23}^1| \le C_k\big[\kappa|V_1|^2_{H^{2k+1}} + |V_2|^2_{H^{2k}} + |V|^2_{H^{m_0}}|\underline{\zeta}|^2_{H^{2k+3}}\big]. \tag{5.18}$$

We write II_{24} as

$$\begin{aligned}
II_{24} &= -\kappa(\tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma\underline{G}V_2, \nabla_X\cdot\tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma\nabla_X V_1)\\
&= -\kappa(\tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma\underline{G}V_2, \sigma\nabla_X\cdot\sigma^{-1}\tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma\nabla_X V_1)\\
&\quad +\kappa(\tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma\underline{G}V_2, \sigma(\nabla_X\sigma^{-1})\cdot\tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma\nabla_X V_1)\\
&= -\kappa(\tilde{\Lambda}^k\,\sigma\underline{G}V_2,\ [\sigma\nabla_X\,\sigma^{-1},\ \tilde{\Lambda}^k]\cdot\,\sigma\nabla_X V_1)\\
&\quad -\kappa(\tilde{\Lambda}^k\,\sigma\underline{G}V_2,\ \tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma\nabla_X\cdot\nabla_X V_1)\\
&\quad +\kappa(\tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma\underline{G}V_2, [\sigma(\nabla_X\sigma^{-1}),\tilde{\Lambda}^k]\cdot\sigma\nabla_X V_1)\\
&\quad +\kappa(\tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma\underline{G}V_2, \tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma(\nabla_X\sigma^{-1})\cdot\sigma\nabla_X V_1)\\
&\triangleq II_{24}^1 + \cdots + II_{24}^4.
\end{aligned}$$

As in (5.16), we have

$$|II_{24}^3| \le C_k\big[\kappa|V_1|^2_{H^{2k+1}} + |V_2|^2_{H^{2k}} + |V|^2_{H^{m_0}}|\underline{\zeta}|^2_{H^{2k+3}}\big]. \tag{5.19}$$

And from the above calculations, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
&II_{23}^2 + II_{24}^2 + II_{24}^4\\
&= -\kappa(\tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma\underline{G}V_2, \tilde{\Lambda}^k[\sigma^{-1}(\nabla_X\sigma)\cdot\sigma\nabla_X V_1 + \sigma\nabla_X\cdot\nabla_X V_1 - \sigma(\nabla_X\sigma^{-1})\cdot\sigma\nabla_X V_1])\\
&= -\kappa(\tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma\underline{G}V_2, \tilde{\Lambda}^k[\sigma^{-1}(\nabla_X\sigma)\cdot\sigma\nabla_X V_1 + \sigma^{-1}\sigma\nabla_X\cdot\sigma\nabla_X V_1])\\
&= -\kappa(\tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma\underline{G}V_2, \tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma^{-1}\nabla_X\cdot\sigma^2\nabla_X V_1),
\end{aligned}$$

and we also have

$$\begin{aligned}
II_{22}^1 + II_{24}^1 &= -\kappa(\tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma\underline{G}V_2, \sigma\nabla_X\cdot\sigma^{-1}[\sigma\nabla_X\sigma^{-1},\tilde{\Lambda}^k]\sigma V_1)\\
&\quad -\kappa(\tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma\underline{G}V_2, [\sigma\nabla_X\sigma^{-1},\tilde{\Lambda}^k]\cdot\sigma\nabla_X V_1)\\
&= -\kappa(\tilde{\Lambda}^k\,\sigma\underline{G}V_2,\ [(\sigma\nabla_X\,\sigma^{-1}\cdot)^2,\ \tilde{\Lambda}^k]\,\sigma V_1).
\end{aligned}$$

Summing up (5.16)-(5.19), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} II_2 &= -\kappa(\tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma\underline{G}V_2, \tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma^{-1}\nabla_X\cdot(\sigma^2\nabla_X V_1)) \\ &\quad -\kappa(\tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma\underline{G}V_2, [(\sigma\nabla_X\sigma^{-1}\cdot)^2, \tilde{\Lambda}^k]\sigma V_1) + \mathcal{R}_2, \end{aligned}$$

where the remainder terms $\mathcal{R}_2$ satisfies

$$\mathcal{R}_2 \le C_k\big[|(\sqrt{\kappa}V_1, V_2)|^2_{H^{2k+1}\times H^{2k+\frac{1}{2}}} + |V|^2_{H^{m_0}}|\underline{\zeta}|^2_{H^{2k+3}}\big]. \tag{5.20}$$

Similarly, II_3 can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} II_3 &= \kappa(\tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma\underline{G}V_2, \tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma^{-1}\nabla_X\cdot\sigma^6\nabla_X\underline{\zeta}(\nabla_X\underline{\zeta}\cdot\nabla_X V_1)) \\ &\quad \kappa(\tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma\underline{G}V_2, [(\sigma^3\nabla_X\underline{\zeta}\cdot\nabla_X\sigma^{-1}\cdot)^2, \tilde{\Lambda}^k]\,\sigma V_1) + \mathcal{R}_3, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{R}_3$ has the same estimate as $\mathcal{R}_2$. So, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} II &= (\sigma\underline{G}\sigma\tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma^{-1}V_2, \tilde{\Lambda}^k\underline{a}\sigma^{-1}V_1) - (\tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma\underline{G}V_2, \tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma^{-1}\underline{A}\,V_1) \\ &\quad -\kappa(\tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma\underline{G}V_2, [(\sigma\nabla_X\sigma^{-1}\cdot)^2 - (\sigma^3\nabla_X\underline{\zeta}\cdot\nabla_X\sigma^{-1}\cdot)^2, \tilde{\Lambda}^k]\,\sigma V_1) \\ &\quad +\mathcal{R}_1 + \mathcal{R}_2 + \mathcal{R}_3. \end{aligned} \tag{5.21}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} III &= -(\tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma^{-1}\underline{a}V_1, \sigma\underline{G}\sigma\tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma^{-1}V_2) + (\tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma^{-1}\,\underline{A}V_1, [\sigma\underline{G}\sigma, \tilde{\Lambda}^k]\sigma^{-1}V_2) \\ &\quad +(\tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma^{-1}\underline{A}V_1, \tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma\underline{G}\,V_2), \end{aligned}$$

which together with (5.21) gives

$$\begin{aligned} I^1_{22} + I^1_{32} &= -2\kappa(\tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma\underline{G}V_2, [(\sigma\nabla_X\sigma^{-1}\cdot)^2 - (\sigma^3\nabla_X\underline{\zeta}\cdot\nabla_X\sigma^{-1}\cdot)^2, \tilde{\Lambda}^k]\sigma V_1) \\ &\quad +2(\tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma^{-1}\underline{A}V_1, [\sigma\underline{G}\sigma, \tilde{\Lambda}^k]\sigma^{-1}V_2) \\ &\quad +\mathcal{R}_1 + \mathcal{R}_2 + \mathcal{R}_3 \\ &\triangleq \mathcal{R}_4 + \mathcal{R}_5 + \mathcal{R}_1 + \mathcal{R}_2 + \mathcal{R}_3. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.5, Lemma 3.8 and Thm. 4.6, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_4 &\le 2\kappa|\tilde{\Lambda}^k\,\sigma\underline{G}V_2|_{H^{-1}}|[(\sigma\nabla_X\sigma^{-1}\cdot)^2 - (\sigma^3\nabla_X\underline{\zeta}\cdot\nabla_X\sigma^{-1}\cdot)^2, \tilde{\Lambda}^k]\sigma V_1|_{H^1} \\ &\le C_k\big[|(\sqrt{\kappa}V_1, V_2)|^2_{H^{2k+1}\times H^{2k+\frac{1}{2}}} + |V|^2_{H^{m_0}\times H^{m_0}}|\underline{\zeta}|^2_{H^{2k+4}}\big], \\ \mathcal{R}_5 &\le 2|\tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma^{-1}\underline{A}V_1|_{H^{-1}}|[\sigma\underline{G}\sigma, \tilde{\Lambda}^k]\sigma^{-1}V_2|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}} \\ &\le C_k\big[|(\sqrt{\kappa}V_1, V_2)|^2_{H^{2k+1}\times H^{2k+\frac{1}{2}}} + |V|^2_{H^{m_0}\times H^{m_0+2}}|\underline{\zeta}|^2_{H^{2k+4}}\big]. \end{aligned}$$

which together with (5.7)-(5.14), (5.15) and and (5.20) give

$$\begin{aligned} &|I_2 + I_3| \le C_k(\kappa|V_1|^2_{H^{2k+1}} + |V|^2_{H^{2k}\times H^{2k+\frac{1}{2}}}) \\ &+C_k|V|^2_{H^{m_0}\times H^{m_0+2}}\big(|\underline{\zeta}|^2_{H^{2k+4}} + |\underline{v}|^2_{H^{2k+2}} + |\underline{a} - g|^2_{H^{2k+\frac{1}{2}}} + |\partial_t\underline{\zeta}|^2_{H^{2k+2}}\big) \\ &+C_k\big[|H|^2_{H^{2k+1}\times H^{2k+\frac{1}{2}}} + |H|^2_{H^{m_0}}|\underline{\zeta}|^2_{H^{2k+2}}\big]. \end{aligned}$$

Estimates of $I_4 - I_7$. Since the estimates are very similar as above but much simpler (by Lemma 3.5, and Prop. 3.19 in [13] for I_4), we omit it here. We have

$$\begin{aligned}&|I_4 + \cdots + I_7|\\&\quad \le C_k\big[\kappa|V_1|^2_{H^{2k+1}} + |V|^2_{H^{2k}\times H^{2k+\frac12}} + |V|^2_{H^{m_0}}\big(|\underline{\zeta}|^2_{H^{2k+4}} + |\partial_t\underline{\zeta}|^2_{H^{2k+2}}\big)\big].\end{aligned}$$

The total energy estimate. We finally obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{d}{dt}e^{-2\lambda t}E_k(V)\\&\le -2\lambda e^{-2\lambda t}E_k(V) + e^{-2\lambda t}C_k\big(\kappa|V_1|^2_{H^{2k+1}} + |V|^2_{H^{2k}\times H^{2k+\frac12}}\big)\\&+e^{-2\lambda t}C_k|V|^2_{H^{m_0}\times H^{m_0+2}}\big(|\underline{\zeta}|^2_{H^{2k+4}} + |\underline{v}|^2_{H^{2k+2}} + |\underline{a}-g|^2_{H^{2k+\frac12}} + |\partial_t\underline{\zeta}|^2_{H^{2k+2}}\big)\\&+e^{-2\lambda t}C_k\big[|H|^2_{H^{2k+1}\times H^{2k+\frac12}} + |H|^2_{H^{m_0}}|\underline{\zeta}|^2_{H^{2k+2}}\big]. \qquad (5.22)\end{aligned}$$

To complete the energy estimates, we still need the following lemma:

Lemma 5.3. There exists a positive constant C_{m_0} depending only k, $|\underline{a}|_{L^\infty}$, and $|\underline{\zeta}|_{H^{m_0+3}}$ such that the following inequalities hold

$$\begin{aligned}E_k(V) &\ge C_{m_0}^{-1}\big(|(\sqrt{\kappa}V_1, V_2)|^2_{H^{2k+1}\times H^{2k+\frac12}} + \inf_{(t,X)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d}\underline{a}(t,X)|V_1|^2_{H^{2k}}\big)\\&\quad -C_{m_0}|V|^2_{H^{m_0}}(1+|\nabla_X\underline{\zeta}|^2_{H^{2k+1}}),\\E_k(V) &\le C_{m_0}\big(|(\sqrt{\kappa}V_1, V_2)|^2_{H^{2k+1}\times H^{2k+\frac12}} + |V_1|^2_{H^{2k}}\big)\\&\quad +C_{m_0}|V|^2_{H^{m_0}}(1+|\nabla_X\underline{\zeta}|^2_{H^{2k+1}}).\end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma 5.3. We write

$$E_k(V) = E_k(V_1) + E_k(V_2).$$

where

$$E_k(V_1) = (\tilde\Lambda^k\sigma V_1, \sigma^{-1}(\underline{a}-\underline{A})\sigma^{-1}\tilde\Lambda^k\sigma V_1), \quad E_k(V_2) = (\tilde\Lambda^k\sigma^{-1}V_2, \sigma\underline{G}\sigma\tilde\Lambda^k\sigma^{-1}V_2).$$

Set $f = \sigma^{-1}\tilde\Lambda^k\sigma V_1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}E_k(V_1) &= (f, \underline{a}-\underline{A}f)\\&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\underline{a}|f|^2dX + \kappa\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\frac{(1+|\nabla_X\underline{\zeta}|^2)|\nabla_X f|^2 - |\nabla_X\underline{\zeta}\cdot\nabla_X f|^2}{(1+|\nabla_X\underline{\zeta}|^2)^{\frac32}}dX,\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$C_{m_0}^{-1}\kappa|\nabla_X f|^2_{L^2} \le E_k(V_1) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\underline{a}|f|^2dX \le C_{m_0}\kappa|\nabla_X f|^2_{L^2}.$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 3.5-3.7 we have

$$\begin{aligned}&|f|^2_{L^2} \ge C_{m_0}^{-1}|V_1|^2_{H^{2k}} - C_{m_0}|V_1|^2_{H^{m_0}}(1+|\nabla_X\underline{\zeta}|^2_{H^{2k}}),\\&|f|^2_{L^2} \le C_{m_0}\big[|V_1|^2_{H^{2k}} + |V_1|^2_{H^{m_0}}(1+|\nabla_X\underline{\zeta}|^2_{H^{2k}})\big],\\&|\nabla_X f|^2_{L^2} \ge C_{m_0}^{-1}|V_1|^2_{H^{2k+1}} - C_{m_0}|V_1|^2_{H^{m_0}}(1+|\nabla_X\underline{\zeta}|^2_{H^{2k+1}}),\\&|\nabla_X f|^2_{L^2} \le C_{m_0}\big[|V_1|^2_{H^{2k+1}} + |V_1|^2_{H^{m_0}}(1+|\nabla_X\underline{\zeta}|^2_{H^{2k+1}})\big],\end{aligned}$$

from which, we get

$$\begin{aligned}&E_k(V_1)+C_{m_0}|V_1|^2_{H^{m_0}}(1+|\nabla_X\underline{\zeta}|^2_{H^{2k+1}})\geq C_{m_0}^{-1}\big[\kappa|V_1|^2_{H^{2k+1}}+\inf\underline{a}|V_1|^2_{H^{2k}}\big],\\&E_k(V_1)\leq C_{m_0}\big[\kappa|V_1|^2_{H^{2k+1}}+|V_1|^2_{H^{2k}}+|V_1|^2_{H^{m_0}}(1+|\nabla_X\underline{\zeta}|^2_{H^{2k+1}})\big].\end{aligned}$$

We now turn to $E_k(V_2)$. Set $g=\sigma\tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma^{-1}V_2$, we have

$$E_k(V_2)=(\tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma^{-1}V_2,\sigma\underline{G}\sigma\tilde{\Lambda}^k\sigma^{-1}V_2)\triangleq(g,\underline{G}g),$$

which together with Lemma 3.5, Lemma 3.7 and Prop. 4.3 gives

$$\begin{aligned}E_k(V_2)&\geq C|g|^2_{H^{\frac12}}-\mu|g|^2_{L^2}\\&=C|\tilde{\Lambda}^k\,\sigma^{-1}V_2|^2_{H^{\frac12}}-\mu|\tilde{\Lambda}^k\,\sigma^{-1}V_2|^2_{L^2}\\&\geq C_{m_0}^{-1}|V_2|^2_{H^{2k+\frac12}}-C_{m_0}|V_2|^2_{H^{m_0}}(1+|\nabla_X\underline{\zeta}|^2_{H^{2k+\frac12}})\\&\quad-C_{m_0}|V_2|^2_{H^{2k}}-C_{m_0}|V_2|^2_{H^{m_0}}|\nabla_X\underline{\zeta}|^2_{H^{2k}}]\\&\geq C_{m_0}^{-1}|V_2|^2_{H^{2k+\frac12}}-C_{m_0}|V_2|^2_{H^{m_0}}(1+|\nabla_X\underline{\zeta}|^2_{H^{2k+\frac12}}),\end{aligned}$$

which leads to

$$E_k(V_2)+C_{m_0}|V_2|^2_{H^{m_0}}(1+|\nabla_X\underline{\zeta}|^2_{H^{2k+\frac12}})\geq C_{m_0}^{-1}|V_2|^2_{H^{2k+\frac12}}.$$

And we also have from Prop. 4.3 and Lemma 3.5

$$E_k(V_2)\leq C_{m_0}|V_2|^2_{H^{2k+\frac12}}+C_{m_0}|V_2|^2_{H^{m_0}}(1+|\nabla_X\underline{\zeta}|^2_{H^{2k+\frac12}}).$$

This finishes the proof of Lemma 5.3. □

Now we are in a position to complete the proof of Proposition 5.2. By (5.22) and Lemma 5.3, we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{d}{dt}e^{-2\lambda t}E_k(V)\\&\leq(-2\lambda+C_k)e^{-2\lambda t}E_k(V)\\&+e^{-2\lambda t}C_k|V|^2_{H^{m_0}\times H^{m_0+2}}\big(1+|\underline{\zeta}|^2_{H^{2k+4}}+|\underline{v}|^2_{H^{2k+2}}+|\underline{a}-g|^2_{H^{2k+\frac12}}+|\partial_t\underline{\zeta}|^2_{H^{2k+2}}\big)\\&+e^{-2\lambda t}C_k\big[|H|^2_{H^{2k+1}\times H^{2k+\frac12}}+|H|^2_{H^{m_0}}(1+|\underline{\zeta}|^2_{H^{2k+2}})\big].\end{aligned}\tag{5.23}$$

Taking λ such that $-2\lambda+C_k\leq 0$, the first estimate of the Proposition follows easily from Lemma 5.3. Note that the constant C_k in (5.22) is independent of κ. So, if $\underline{a}$ satisfies (5.5), C_k in (5.23) is also independent of κ by Lemma 5.3.

This completes the proof of Proposition 5.2. □

5.3. **The Lévy condition.** Let us introduce the pressure $\underline{P}$ as

$$-\underline{P}=\partial_t\underline{\phi}+\frac12|\nabla_{X,y}\underline{\phi}|^2+gy.$$

where $\underline{\phi}$ is a solution of the elliptic equations

$$\begin{cases}-\Delta_{X,y}\underline{\phi}=0\qquad\text{on}\quad\Omega(t),\\ \underline{\phi}|_{y=\underline{\zeta}(t,X)}=-\underline{\psi}(t,x),\quad\partial_{n_-}\underline{\phi}|_{y=b(X)}=0.\end{cases}$$

If the admissible reference $\underline{U}$ solves the water wave problem (5.1) at time t_0, we find from the proof of Proposition 4.4 in [13] that

$$\underline{P}|_{y=\underline{\zeta}(t_0,X)} = -\kappa\nabla_X\cdot\Big(\frac{\nabla_X\underline{\zeta}(t_0,X)}{\sqrt{1+|\nabla_X\underline{\zeta}(t_0,X)|^2}}\Big), \tag{5.24}$$

$$\begin{aligned}-\partial_{n_+}\underline{P}|_{y=\underline{\zeta}(t_0,X)} &= \underline{a}(t_0,X)\\ &-\kappa\frac{\nabla_X\underline{\zeta}(t_0,X)\cdot\nabla_X}{\sqrt{1+|\nabla_X\underline{\zeta}(t_0,X)|^2}}\nabla_X\cdot\Big(\frac{\nabla_X\underline{\zeta}(t_0,X)}{\sqrt{1+|\nabla_X\underline{\zeta}(t_0,X)|^2}}\Big).\end{aligned} \tag{5.25}$$

So, the Lévy condition is equivalent to the Taylor sign condition for $\kappa = 0$. In what follows, we show that

Proposition 5.4. Let $b = -1$. If $\underline{U}$ solves the water wave problem (5.1) at time t_0 and the surface tension coefficient κ is sufficiently small, the Lévy condition still holds: there exists $c_0 > 0$ such that

$$\underline{a}(t_0,X) \geq c_0 \quad \text{on} \quad \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Proof. Note that $-\Delta_{X,y}\underline{P} = \Delta(\frac{1}{2}|\nabla_{X,y}\underline{\phi}|^2)$ and

$$\Delta(\frac{1}{2}|\nabla_{X,y}\underline{\phi}|^2) = |\nabla^2_{X,y}\underline{\phi}|^2, \quad -\partial_{n_-}(\frac{1}{2}|\nabla_{X,y}\underline{\phi}|^2)|_{y=-1} = 0,$$

we have

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{X,y}\underline{P} = |\nabla^2_{X,y}\underline{\phi}|^2 \text{on} \quad \Omega(t), \\ \underline{P}|_{y=\underline{\zeta}(t_0,X)} = -\kappa\nabla_X\cdot\big(\frac{\nabla_X\underline{\zeta}(t_0,X)}{\sqrt{1+|\nabla_X\underline{\zeta}(t_0,X)|^2}}\big), \quad \partial_{n_-}\underline{P}|_{y=-1} = g. \end{cases}$$

From (5.25), it suffices to prove that if κ is sufficiently small, there exists a constant c_0 such that $-\partial_{n_+}\underline{P}|_{y=\underline{\zeta}(t_0,X)} \geq 2c_0$. We will follow the argument of Lemma 4.1 in [19]. We denote by Γ_t the free surface, and by Γ_b the bottom. For any $h \in C^1_0(\Gamma_t), h \geq 0$, let w be a solution of the elliptic equation

$$-\Delta w = 0, \quad w|_{\Gamma_t} = h, \quad \frac{\partial w}{\partial n}|_{\Gamma_b} = 0.$$

Applying Green's second identity to w and $\underline{P} + gy$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}-\int_{\Gamma_t} w\frac{\partial\underline{P}}{\partial n}dS &= \int_{\Omega(t)}|\nabla^2_{X,y}\underline{\phi}|^2 w dV - \int_{\Gamma_t}\underline{P}\frac{\partial w}{\partial n}dS\\ &+g\int_{\Gamma_t}(w\frac{\partial y}{\partial n} - y\frac{\partial w}{\partial n})dS.\end{aligned}$$

Applying Green's second identity again to w and y, we get

$$\int_{\Gamma_t}(w\frac{\partial y}{\partial n} - y\frac{\partial w}{\partial n})dS = \int_{\Gamma_b} w dS.$$

Let $G = G(\eta,\xi)$ be the Green's function on $\Omega(t)$, i.e.

$$\Delta_\xi G(\eta,\xi) = \delta_\eta(\xi) \quad G(\eta,\xi)|_{\Gamma_t} = 0, \quad \frac{\partial G(\eta,\xi)}{\partial n(\xi)}|_{\Gamma_b} = 0.$$

Then we have Green's representation formula

$$w(\eta)=\int_{\Gamma_t}h(\xi)\frac{\partial G(\eta,\xi)}{\partial n(\xi)}dS(\xi),\quad \text{for } \eta\in\Omega(t).$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}-\int_{\Gamma_t}h(\xi)\frac{\partial\underline{P}}{\partial n}dS(\xi)\geq&\int_{\Gamma_t}h(\xi)\big(\int_{\Gamma_b}\frac{\partial G(\eta,\xi)}{\partial n(\xi)}dS(\eta)\big)dS(\xi)\\&-\int_{\Gamma_t}h(\xi)\frac{\partial}{\partial n(\xi)}\big(\int_{\Gamma_t}\underline{P}(\eta)\frac{\partial G(\eta,\xi)}{\partial n(\eta)}dS(\eta)\big)dS(\xi).\end{aligned}\tag{5.26}$$

From the maximal principle, we know that there exists a constant c_0 such that

$$\int_{\Gamma_b}\frac{\partial G(\eta,\xi)}{\partial n(\xi)}dS(\eta)\geq 3c_0,\quad \text{for any } \xi\in\Gamma_t.$$

Since $h\geq 0$ is arbitrary, we get from (5.26) and (5.24) that

$$-\partial_{n_+}\underline{P}|_{y=\underline{\zeta}(t_0,X)}\geq 2c_0,$$

if κ is sufficiently small. $\square$

6. The Nonlinear Equations and zero surface tension limit

6.1. **The water wave equations with surface tension.**

Assume that the surface tension coefficient $\kappa>0$. Then we prove

Theorem 6.1. Let $b\in C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. There exists $P>D>0$ such that for all $\zeta_0\in H^{s+P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and ψ_0 be such that $\nabla_X\psi_0\in H^{s+P}(\mathbb{R}^d)^d$, with $s>M$ (M depends on d only). Assume moreover that

$$\min\{\zeta_0-b,-b\}\geq 2h_0 \qquad \text{on} \quad \mathbb{R}^d \qquad \text{for some} \quad h_0\geq 0.$$

Then there exist $T>0$ and a unique solution (ζ,ψ) to the water-wave system (1.11) with the initial condition (ζ_0,ψ_0) and such that $(\zeta,\psi-\psi_0)\in C^1([0,T],H^{s+D}(\mathbb{R}^d)\times H^{s+D}(\mathbb{R}^d))$.

We will use a simplified Nash-Moser theorem in [3] to solve (1.11). We rewrite the water wave equations (1.11) as

$$\partial_t U+\mathcal{F}(U)=0,\quad U(0,x)=U_0(x),\tag{6.1}$$

where $U=(\zeta,\psi)^T$ and $\mathcal{F}(U)=(\mathcal{F}_1(U),\mathcal{F}_2(U)^T$ with $\mathcal{F}_1(U)$ and $\mathcal{F}_2(U)$ given by (5.2). In order to use Theorem 1(with $\varepsilon=1,\mathcal{L}=0$) in [3], we firstly verify the assumptions on the nonlinear operator $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$. Assume that $\underline{U}$ is an admissible reference state. Note that $\underline{U}$ dose not necessarily belong to Sobolev space because $\underline{\psi}|_{t=0}$ is not necessarily in a Sobolev space (though its gradient is). In what follows, we use $|\underline{U}|_{H^a}$ to denote the quantity

$$|\underline{U}|_{H^a}:=|\underline{U}-\underline{U}|_{t=0}|_{H^a}+|\nabla_X\underline{U}|_{t=0}|_{H^{a-1}}.$$

By Prop. 4.2, there holds for $a\geq q_0$

$$|\mathcal{F}(\underline{U})|_{H^a_T}\leq C(a,|\underline{U}|_{H^{q_0}_T})|\underline{U}|_{H^{a+2}_T}.$$

We know from the expression of $d_{\underline{U}}\mathcal{F}$ that

$$d_{\underline{U}}\mathcal{F}\cdot U=\begin{pmatrix} -d_{\underline{\zeta}}G(\cdot)\underline{\psi}\cdot\zeta-G(\underline{\zeta})\psi \\ g\zeta-\underline{Z}d_{\underline{\zeta}}G(\cdot)\underline{\psi}\cdot\zeta-\underline{Zv}\cdot\nabla_X\zeta+\underline{A}\zeta-\underline{Z}G(\underline{\zeta})\psi+\underline{v}\cdot\nabla_X\psi \end{pmatrix},$$

from which and Prop. 3.25 in [13], it follows that for $a\geq q_0$

$$|d_{\underline{U}}\mathcal{F}\cdot U|_{H^a_T}\leq C(a,|\underline{U}|_{H^{q_0}_T},T)\big[|U|_{H^{a+2}_T}+|U|_{H^{q_0}_T}|\underline{U}|_{H^{a+2}_T}\big].$$

We can compute $d^2_{\underline{U}}\mathcal{F}$ from the expression of $d_{\underline{U}}\mathcal{F}$, and then get by Prop. 3.25 in [13] that for $a\geq q_0$

$$\begin{aligned}|d^2_{\underline{U}}\mathcal{F}\cdot(U,V)|_{H^a_T} \;\leq\; & C(a,B,|\underline{U}|_{H^{q_0}_T},T)\big[|U|_{H^{q_0}_T}|V|_{H^{a+2}_T}+|U|_{H^{a+2}_T}|V|_{H^{q_0}_T}\\ &+|U|_{H^{q_0}_T}|V|_{H^{q_0}_T}|\underline{U}|_{H^{a+2}_T}\big].\end{aligned}$$

To verify the assumptions on the linearized equations, we need to introduce two scales of Banach spaces X^a and F^a as follows:

$$X^a=\bigcap_{j=0}^{1}C^j([0,T];H^{a-2j}(\mathbb{R}^d)^2),\quad |u|_{X^a}=\sum_{j=0}^{1}|\partial_t^j u|_{H^{a-2j}_T},$$

$$F^a=C([0,T];H^a(\mathbb{R}^d)^2)\times H^a(\mathbb{R}^d)^2,\quad |(f,g)|_{F^a}=|f|_{H^a_T}+|g|_{H^a},$$

and for $(f,g)\in F^a$ and $t\in[0,T]$,

$$\mathcal{I}^a(t,f,g)=|g|_{H^a}+\int_0^t\sup_{t''\in[0,t']}|f(t'')|_{H^a}dt'.$$

We consider the linearized system of (6.1)

$$\begin{cases}\underline{\mathcal{M}}V=H\\ V|_{t=0}=V_0\end{cases},\quad\text{with}\quad \underline{\mathcal{M}}=\partial_t+\begin{pmatrix}\nabla_X\cdot(\cdot\underline{v}) & -G(\underline{\zeta})\\ \underline{a}-\underline{A} & \underline{v}\cdot\nabla_X\end{pmatrix}. \tag{6.2}$$

For any $s\geq q_0,\underline{U}\in X^{s+4},(H,V_0)\in F^{s+1}$, from Prop. 5.2, there exists a unique solution $V\in C([0,T];H^s(\mathbb{R}^d))$ to (6.2) such that

$$|V|_{H^s_T}\leq C(s,\kappa,|\underline{U}|_{X^{q_0}},T)\big(\mathcal{I}^{s+1}(t,H,V_0)+|\underline{U}|_{X^{s+4}}\mathcal{I}^{q_0}(t,H,V_0)\big). \tag{6.3}$$

Then Theorem 1 in [3] ensures that there exist $T>0$ and a unique solution U to (6.1).

6.2. **Zero surface tension limit.** For the flat bottom, we prove that

Theorem 6.2. Let $b=-1$ and (ζ_0,ψ_0) satisfy the same assumptions as Theorem 6.1. Assume that the surface tension coefficient κ is sufficiently small. Then there exist $T>0$ independent of κ and a unique solution $(\zeta^\kappa,\psi^\kappa)$ to (1.11) with $\kappa>0$ such that $(\zeta^\kappa,\psi^\kappa-\psi_0)\in C^1([0,T],\,H^{s+D}(\mathbb{R}^d)\times H^{s+D}(\mathbb{R}^d))$. Moreover, as κ tends to zero, the solution $(\zeta^\kappa,\psi^\kappa)$ converges to the solution (ζ,ψ) of (1.11) with $\kappa=0$.

Proof. If the surface tension coefficient κ is sufficiently small, the Lévy condition holds. Thus, the estimate (6.3) is independent of κ by Prop 5.2. By Theorem 1 in [3], there exist $T>0$ independent of κ and a unique solution U^κ of (6.1) which is bounded in $C([0,T];H^{s+D}(\mathbb{R}^d))$. Then there exists a subsequence of $\{U^\kappa\}_{\kappa>0}$ which converges weakly to some U. By a standard compactness argument, we can prove that U is a solution of (6.1) with $\kappa = 0$.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Professor Ping Zhang and Chongchun Zeng for helpful discussions. This work was done when Zhifei Zhang was visiting Department of Mathematics of Paris-Sud University as a Postdoctor Fellowship. He would like to thank the hospitality and support of the Department.

References

[1] R. A. Adams, Sobolev spaces, Academic Press, New York-London, 1975.

[2] B. Alvarez-Samaniego and D. Lannes, Large time existence for 3D water-waves and asymptotics, *Invent. Math.*, **171** (2008), 485–541.

[3] B. Alvarez-Samaniego and D. Lannes, A Nash-Moser theorem for singular evolution equations. Application to Serre and Green-Naghdi equations, *Indiana University Math. Jour.*, **57** (2008), 97–131.

[4] D. M. Ambrose and N. Masmoudi, The zero surface tension limit of two-dimensional water waves, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **58** (2005), 1287–1315.

[5] D. M. Ambrose and N. Masmoudi, The zero surface tension limit of three-dimensional water waves, *Indiana University Math. Jour.*, in press.

[6] J. L. Bona, J.-C. Saut and D. Lannes, Asymptotic models for internal waves, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **89**(2008), 538–556.

[7] J. M. Bony, Calcul symbolique et propagation des singularités pour les q́uations aux drivées partielles non linéaires, *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup.*, **14** (1981), 209–246.

[8] D. Coutand and S. Shkoller, Well-posedness of the free-surface incompressible Euler equations with or without surface tension, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **20** (2007), 829–930.

[9] W. Craig, An existence theory for water waves and the Boussinesq and Korteweg-de Vries scaling limits, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, **10** (1985), 787–1003.

[10] D. G. Ebin, The equations of motion of a perfect fluid with free boundary are not well posed, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, **12** (1987), 1175–1201.

[11] J. T. Beale, T. Hou and J. S. Lowengrub, Growth rates for the linearized motion of fluid interfaces away from equilibrium, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.,* **46** (1993), 1269–1301.

[12] T. Hou, Z. Teng and P. W. Zhang, Well-posedness of linearized motion for 3-D water waves far from equilibrium, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations,* **21** (1996), 1551–1585.

[13] D. Lannes, Well-posedness of the water-waves equations, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **18** (2005), 605–654.

[14] D. Lannes, Sharp estimates for pseudo-differential operators with symbols of llimited smoothness and commutators, *Journal of Functional Analysis*, **232**(2006), 495–539.

[15] H. Lindblad, Well-posedness for the motion of an incompressible liquid with free surface boundary, *Ann. of Math.*, **162** (2005), 109–194.

[16] V. I. Nalimov, The Cauchy-Poisson problem (in Russian), *Dynamika Splosh. Sredy,* **18** (1974), 104-210.

[17] J. Shatah and C. Zeng, Geometry and *a priori* estimates for free boundary problems of the Euler's equation, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.,* **61** (2008), 698-744.

[18] S. Wu, Well-posedness in Sobolev spaces of the full water wave problem in 2-D, *Invent. Math.*, **130** (1997), 39–72.

[19] S. Wu, Well-posedness in Sobolev spaces of the full water wave problem in 3-D, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.,* **12** (1999), 445-495.

[20] H. Yosihara, Gravity waves on the free surface of an incompressible perfect fluid of finite depth, *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.*, **18** (1982), 49–96.
[21] V. E. Zakharov, Stability of periodic waves of finite amplitude on the surface of a deep fluid, *J. Appl. Mech. Tech. Phys.*, **9**(1968), 190–194.
[22] P. Zhang and Z. Zhang, On the free boundary problem of three-dimensional incompressible Euler equations, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.,* **61** (2008), 877–940.

Academy of Mathematics & Systems Science, CAS, Beijing 100190, P. R. China
E-mail address: `mingmeim2@gmail.com`

School of Mathematical Sciences, Peking University, 100871, P. R. China and Departement de Mathematique, Universite Paris Sud, 91405 Orsay Cedex, FRANCE
E-mail address: `zfzhang@math.pku.edu.cn`